

THE  
CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

NO. XC.—OCTOBER, 1857.

ART. I.—JEHOVAH JIREH.

THE obedience of Abraham in proceeding to offer up his only son as a burnt sacrifice, at the command of God, was the crowning act of a perfected faith. More than sixty years had the patriarch been trained in this Divine school. He left his native land and the graves of his fathers at the call of God, to go to a land that He would show him. There he walked by faith. He believed God in all His promises. And, after the time was past in which the promise of a numerous posterity could be fulfilled, according to the course of nature, he still believed God, and this faith was reckoned to him for righteousness. To use the forcible language of the Apostle, he “against hope believed in hope,” “he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith giving glory to God: being fully persuaded, that what He had promised He was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to Him for righteousness.” Isaac was born, the pledge of the high promises and mighty expectations which clustered around his birth.

But when this child of promise and of miracle had reached the age of twenty-five years,—according to the current chronology,—a command came from God to Abraham which must have shocked his natural sensibilities, and which seems, at first thought, sufficient to have prostrated the strongest

faith. That command was, "Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt offering, upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of." It must have required the strongest evidence to convince Abraham that a command so terrible, so revolting to parental feeling, so entirely at variance with what God had taught him to expect from this child, could come from God. But it appears that it came to him in such a manner that he had no doubt on that point. He had the clearest proof that the command was from God. He arose, therefore, without hesitation, early in the morning, took with him two of his young men, with Isaac his son, and the wood for the sacrifice, to go to the place appointed. On the third day they came in sight of the place. There Abraham left his servants with the ass, laid the wood upon Isaac, took the fire and the knife in his hand, and they two went on together to the chosen spot. Gen. xxii: 1.

Who can imagine the feelings of Abraham during this silent walk! For three days he had borne in his own bosom alone, the awful secret of the object of this journey. The mother, the wife of his bosom, knew not the terrible bereavement that awaited her. Isaac had not been told of his impending doom. No farewells had been exchanged, yet the fatal moment was just at hand. Isaac broke the silence. "My father, behold the fire and the wood, but where is the Lamb for a burnt offering?" The reply of Abraham, as his words are translated in our English version, was, "My son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering." When the trial was over, it is recorded (v. 14,) that, "Abraham called the name of that place JEHOVAH JIREH," which, translated by the same rule as his reply to Isaac, would be, "JEHOVAH WILL PROVIDE." And, according to this construction of the words, when Abraham had built the altar, attempted to slay his son, was forbidden to do it, and saw the ram caught in the thicket, he then saw the fulfilment of his words. The Lamb *was provided*.

But is this the meaning of the words? Are they cor-

rectly translated? Did Abraham mean to say to Isaac, "God *will* provide?" He knew that God *had* already appointed the victim for the sacrifice. Did he mean to tell a known falsehood? For what else can be made out of the answer, "God *will* provide," when he knew that God *had* provided? Doubtless, Abraham wished to evade a full and direct reply to his son's question, but is it possible to believe that he resorted to falsehood to do it? It is natural to suppose that Abraham, in these trying circumstances, would endeavor to frame such a reply to his son's question as would silence further inquiry, while it did not reveal to Isaac the dreadful secret. But it is shocking to our moral feelings to believe that the last answer of the father to his trusting child, staggering under the burden of the wood that was to consume his body to ashes, would be words of falsehood, of equivocation, or of insincerity.

Nor is it probable that Abraham uttered these words without a full perception of their meaning. The question of Isaac was such an one as he must have anticipated. It was a perfectly natural question. He must have been prepared for it with a sincere, definite and true reply, yet such a reply as would impress the mind of Isaac with the awful sacredness of God's command, while the truth that *he* was to be the victim would still be unrevealed.

But, waiving this really insuperable difficulty, the falsity or insincerity of the reply,—"God *will* provide,"—let us see whether it is really the proper and suitable expression of a perfected faith: It is, undoubtedly, one exercise of faith to believe that God *will* provide for us at all times, in all emergencies, and in this faith Abraham had walked for threescore years. But now he was called to a far higher exercise of faith, so that the sublime words in which he expressed it, became the name of the place on which the Son of God was offered up for the sins of the world. This was the expression of a faith far above that in which he had walked, and by which he was distinguished from the most eminent of the earth. But now a new trial was appointed to him. He knew what it was. Think of a father, sus-

ceptible of the tenderest emotions, called to part with a beloved child, one long waited for, a child of many prayers, an only child,—called, not only to part with this cherished one by death, but to be himself the instrument of that death! His own hand was to deal the fatal blow! His own eyes were to gaze on the deathly pallor, the gurgling blood; his own ears were to hear the convulsive shriek of death, the last struggling gasp; his own hand to carve for the sacrifice, the lifeless form, lovely in death, on which he had gazed with such fond, paternal delight! For three long days the scene had been before his mind; yet while imagination pictured this scene of sorrow, his soul was strong in holy confidence in God. For it is not of the nature of faith to deaden sensibility to bereavement. Abraham was not a stoic; he tenderly loved his son, and would gladly have died for him. But now God required of him a human sacrifice, nay, that he should offer up his only child! Surely Abraham must have had the strongest proof that the command came from God, or he would have shrunk from the act as unnatural and wrong. But the command of God shut out all demur; yet a most formidable difficulty still remained. Isaac was a child of promise and of miracle, on whose continued life depended the fulfilment of the Divine word, that “In Isaac shall thy seed be called.” How could this be fulfilled, if Isaac should be slain? How did Abraham reconcile this difficulty?

Some have supposed that Abraham did not really expect to sacrifice his son. That during the journey he expected that when he came to the trial his hand would be stayed, and that some other victim would be substituted. But this supposition is without evidence, without probability, contrary to the design of the transaction, and contradictory to the express words of Paul. He tells us (Heb. xi: 17—19) that “by faith Abraham, when he was tried, *offered up Isaac*: and he that had received the promises *offered up* his only begotten son, of whom it is said, that in Isaac shall thy seed be called; accounting that God was able to *raise him up, even from the dead*; from whence also he received

him in a figure." The Apostle James, also (ii: 21) says that Abraham was justified, "when *he had offered* Issac, his son, upon the altar." These passages settle the point that the actual *offering up* was, in the mind of Abraham, a fore-gone purpose, and his expectation of the fulfilment of the promise of a posterity through Isaac, was by his resurrection from the dead.

Taking this, then, as the true posture of Abraham's mind when his son put to him the question, "where is the lamb for the burnt offering?" what meaning did he intend in his reply? The proper answer, to meet all the conditions of the case, is this: "My son, GOD HATH PROVIDED Himself a lamb for the burnt offering." But before considering the reasons why this is the meaning suited to meet the exigencies of the case, it is proper to inquire, whether the words which Abraham uttered will admit of this rendering. If the Hebrew words will admit of the translation, "God *hath* provided," and if it is manifest that this is the most appropriate and suitable meaning, then, in the absence of all grammatical objections, it ought to be so translated.

The Hebrew word יְרֵה Jireh, here translated *provide*, is one of very frequent occurrence. Its literal and ordinary meaning is to *see*, to *look*, with the eyes. In the passage under consideration, (Gen. xxii: 8,) it occurs in the *Kal* form of the future. It occurs in this form about four hundred times in the Hebrew Bible; so that if its meaning is to be determined by its usage, we have abundant means for the purpose. The word is in the form of the future, but every scholar familiar with the Hebrew knows that verbs are constantly used in the future form with the signification of past time; and in the past form to signify future time. This is not the place to discuss the reasons for this usage of the language, nor the principles by which it is regulated; but the fact is beyond dispute, occurring on every page of the Hebrew Bible.

This word occurs in the book of Genesis, in the very form (future) in which it stands in this (8th) verse, upwards of *seventy* times, and in all except four or five it is correctly

and necessarily translated in the past tense. Take such passages as these: "God *saw* the light that it was good." Genesis, i: 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25. "The sons of God *saw* the daughters of men," &c.—iii: 6. "He *looked* and beheld a well."—xxix: 2. "Jacob lifted up his eyes and *looked*."—xxxii: 2. These are but samples, taken at random, of the almost uniform use of the word, in this form, in the book of Genesis, and in every case it is הָרָה *Jireh*, precisely as in this passage.

In this chapter (Gen. xxii.) the word occurs twice, in addition to the passages we are considering. "Abraham lifted up his eyes and *saw* (*Jireh*) the place afar off."—v. 4. So in verse 13. "Abraham lifted up his eyes and *looked*," (*Jireh*.) Can any grammatical reason be given, in the face of such facts, for departing from the almost uniform usage of the word? Why should the reply of Abraham to Isaac be singled out as an exception? It is a settled point, therefore, that this translation of the word has the authority of the *usus loquendi*, which, if there be no imperative reason existing in the structure of the passage, or the exigency of the case, for a different rendering, decides the question. Will any one pretend that such a reason can be found?

But there is a question, which we shall not here discuss, whether the position and relations of this word to the other members of the sentence do not *require* the meaning of the past tense. This is a question for professed critics in the Hebrew language. It is quite sufficient to our present purpose if we can establish the following points: I. That there is no grammatical objection to this rendering. II. That the usage of the word in this form, especially in the book of Genesis, favors this rendering. III. That the sense and scope of the passage requires it. We humbly submit that that the first two are established, and we shall soon proceed to offer some reasons in support of the third.

But before doing this, let us follow Abraham to the close of his trial. Having built the altar and laid the wood in order, bound his son and placed him upon it, he took the

knife in his hand to deal the fatal stroke. At this moment the Angel Jehovah called to him to desist, and declared his obedience complete. At this moment Abraham saw a ram, caught in a bush by his horns, and he took the ram and offered him for a burnt offering instead of his son. Then (v. 14) we have this record in our version: "And Abraham called the name of that place *Jehovah Jireh*, as it is said to this day, in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen."

Can any one tell the meaning of that verse?—"In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen." *What* shall be seen? The *place*, or the *altar*, or *what*? Can any one believe that the spot was designated by any mark or monument in the time of Moses? Who erected and preserved it, and for what purpose? And is there any evidence that the mountain was called "the mount of the Lord?" Can any one find an intelligible or consistent meaning in this verse? We confess that we cannot, and therefore turn to the Hebrew for light.

There we find that the word **רִאֵה** *Jireh*, occurs twice in verse 14th, that the consonants are precisely the same in both, but that the vowel points of the first give it the form of the *Kal* future, but those of the second, the *Niphal* future, or *passive* sense. But then, we also know, that the *Masoretic* points are no part of the inspired volume. They were affixed by learned Jewish Rabbis some three or four centuries after the Christian era, a thousand years after the Hebrew had become a dead language. So that, although they are worthy of much respect, and doubtless generally accurate, yet we are guilty of no impiety or irreverence, if we go behind the pointing to find a more satisfactory and consistent meaning.

By a very slight change of the pointing, so as to put the last **רִאֵה** *Jireh*, in the *Kal* form, and the word **רֵא** *hor*, *mountain*, into the *absolute*, instead of the *construct* form, we get this meaning from the verse: "And Abraham called the name of that place *Jehovah Jireh*, as it is said, to this day, 'In the mount Jehovah hath provided.'" That

is, the historian says, that this transaction of Abraham, with this expression of his faith, gave rise to the proverb current in his day, "In the mount Jehovah hath provided." When the afflicted children of God were brought into straits, when all was dark and threatening, then they remembered the words which were wrung from the soul of the patriarch Abraham, in the darkest hour of trial that mortal was ever called to pass through, and encouraged their faith by saying, let us be wholly resigned to God, let us pass on to the place of trial, assured that He doeth all things well, for as Abraham found, so shall we find that, "In the mount the Lord hath provided."

How suitable, how impressive, how cheering this proverb, founded on this example of the father of the faithful, to the tried and afflicted people of God! Does not every reader see that this construction of the passage places the whole transaction in a far clearer and more instructive light? But then, it may be asked, how came the Masorites first, and our translators after them, to fall into such mistakes, if mistakes they really are? Let us see if any light can be thrown on this question.

The Greek translation of the Old Testament, made by unknown persons of Alexandria, a few centuries before the birth of Christ, may have led the Masorites astray. The translation of the LXX. is singularly inconsistent. In the eighth verse we have *εἰπε δὲ Αβραὰμ, ὁ Θεός οὐφεταὶ ξαντῷ προβάτῳ εἰς ολοκαυτώσιν*: "Abraham said, God will see to Himself a lamb for the holocaust." Here the word **πράτη** *Jireh*, is translated in the future. But in verse fourteenth we find the rendering *καὶ εκάλεσεν Αβραὰμ τὸ ονόμα τὸν τόπουν εκείνουν, καὶ οἶδεν; οὐαὶ εἰπώσι σημερον, εν τῷ ορει κυρίος ωφελη* "Abraham called the name of that place, the Lord saw; so that they say, to this day, in the mount the Lord was seen." It is quite evident, therefore, that the Alexandrian translators did not understand the meaning of these expressions, and how far the Masorites were misled by that version, it is impossible now to say. But it is quite evident that neither of them understood the meaning of the passage, because they were strangers to

its spirit. The one makes the fourteenth verse a proverb, yet expressive of the trite and, so far as we know, untrue meaning, "In the mount the Lord was seen," while the other, to escape this inconsistency, makes it to be no proverb, but a tradition, that "In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen." And our translators appear to have compromised the matter, by following the Septuagint in the eighth verse, and translating the fourteenth so that it is impossible to tell what it means, if, indeed, it means anything at all.

From all this confusion we claim the right of appeal, by going behind our English translators, the Alexandrian, and the dots of the Masorites, to the text which Moses penned by inspiration, and there we find, as has been shown, abundant authority for translating **הָרָא** in the past tense, in all the three instances of its occurrence, according to the almost uniform usage of the word. No Hebrew scholar will pretend that there is any grammatical necessity for translating the word, in either instance, in the future tense, and if the past tense is the more suitable, consistent and intelligible reading, we have the fullest authority from the usage of the word for that rendering.

Gesenius defines the words, **הָרָא** "to look out any thing for one's self, i. e., to provide, to choose out," and then translates verse fourteenth thus: "And Abraham called the name of that place, (Moriah,) Jehovah chooseth." He was evidently embarrassed with all attempts to give the word in that place a future meaning, so he fell back on the present time; thus, instead of making Abraham say, "Jehovah will choose," which would be a manifest absurdity, he translates the words, "Jehovah chooseth." If then we substitute the word *choose*, in verse eight, for the word *provide*, and retain the future tense, we make Abraham say to Isaac, "God will choose a Lamb," &c. This would make Abraham tell a direct, known falsehood, and is, therefore, inadmissible. But if the word *choose* be employed to translate **הָרָא** *Jireh*,—to which we have no objection,—then, on our principle of translation, Abraham's answer would be, "My son, God hath chosen a

lamb for the sacrifice." And the name of the place would mean, verse fourteen, "*Jehovah hath chosen.*" There is therefore, no obstacle in the way of our translation, except the vowel pointing of two words in verse fourteenth; while there are serious if not insuperable obstacles to any other translation. Make this slight change in the pointing, and then grammatical rules, the *usus loquendi* and the obvious scope of the passage, all require our rendering of the words. And as no one will pretend that the Masoretic pointing is decisive, because the Masorites were guided in affixing the points by *their* understanding of the meaning, we have the right to find out a more consistent meaning, drawn from a more thorough and comprehensive understanding of the Scriptures, and the nature of Abraham's trial.

The sum of the matter, then, so far as grammatical principles are concerned, is this: The English translation, being founded on the Masoretic pointing, has no authority in the case. There are, then, but two witnesses to examine; the Masoretic pointing and the Septuagint, if, indeed, the one does not lean on the other, so that the two are really but one. But their witness does not agree together. One or the other must be set aside. But the Septuagint has the advantage of a far higher antiquity, and the Masoretic pointing seems to be a compromise between an attempt to follow the Septuagint, and a desire to perpetuate a tradition of the spot where the transaction occurred. The Septuagint cannot be followed wholly; the Masorites appear to have been led astray by it, and give an ambiguous, inconsistent and untenable form of construction.

With all due deference, therefore, we rule out the testimony of both, and appeal, for the meaning of the fourteenth verse, to the original and only inspired record. When, as usage requires that we translate the eighth verse, "God HATH chosen (or provided) a lamb," &c., and the fourteenth verse, "Abraham called the name of that place, JEHOVAH HATH CHOSEN," we feel under no obligation to turn the latter part of the verse into nonsense, in a vain

attempt to follow the senseless pointing of the Masorites, but fall back on the original record, and translate the remainder of the verse just as if the points had never been placed there.

We present a translation of the entire passage, that the meaning of the whole may be seen:

GENESIS—TWENTY-SECOND CHAPTER.

After these things, God did try\* Abraham; and He said to him, "Abraham!" He answered, "Here am I." And He said, "Take now thy son, thine only son, whom thou lovest,—Isaac,—and get thee to the land of Moriah, and offer him there, a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of." So Abraham arose early in the morning, saddled his ass, took with him two of his servants and Isaac his son, split the wood for the burnt offering, and departed to go to the place of which God had spoken to him. On the third day Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw the place at a distance.

Then Abraham said to his servants, "Stay here by the ass, while I, with the lad, will go yonder and worship, and return to you." So Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering, and laid it upon Isaac his son, and he took the fire and the knife in his hand, and they two went on together.

And Isaac spoke to Abraham his father, and said, "Father?" and he answered, "What, my child?" And he said, "Here is the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for the burnt offering?" Abraham answered, "God hath provided himself a lamb for the burnt offering, my child;" and they two went on together.

So they came to the place which God had told him of; and Abraham built there an altar, laid the wood in order, and he bound Isaac his son, and placed him on the altar, upon the wood. Then Abraham reached forth his hand, and took the knife to kill his son; but the Angel Jehovah called to him out of heaven, "Abraham! Abraham!!" He answered, "Here am I." And He said, "Lay not thy hand upon the child, nor do anything to him, for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thy only son, from me."

Then Abraham lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold a ram was caught by his horns in a bush; and Abraham took the ram, and offered it for a burnt offering instead of his son. And Abraham called the name of that place, JEHOVAH HATH PROVIDED: whence the proverb† to this day, "In the mountain Jehovah hath provided." And the Angel Jehovah called to Abraham from heaven the second time, and said, "I have surely sworn by myself, saith Jehovah, that because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thy only son, from me,—I will greatly bless thee, and will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven and as the sands on the sea shore, and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies, and in thy seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice."

\* For the meaning of יְהוָה compare its use in Ex. xv: 25, I Sam. xvii: 39, Ecc. vii: 23.

† Since this article was written, we find that Dathe, in his Latin translation, Halle, 1781, understands this as an old proverb. He translates verse fourteen:

Such is the brief and simple record of one of the most remarkable transactions in the history of our race. It marks one of the great epochs of human affairs. Previous to this transaction, the promises to Abraham respecting his posterity were strong, but now they were confirmed by the oath of God. Abraham had "patiently endured," and now the promise was made sure. And "because God could swear by no greater, he sware by himself, saying, surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee."—Heb. vi. 14—15. The whole transaction is so evidently typical of the Redeemer, that no argument is needed to prove it. The command to sacrifice Isaac comes from God—Elohim,—and Abraham replies to the question of Isaac, *Elohim Jireh*,—God hath provided. But the countering order come from the Angel Jehovah. And Abraham called the name of that place, not *Elohim Jireh*, but *Jehovah Jireh*. The first is the God of law, the other the God of grace; the first is the God of justice, the other the God of mercy. When he replied to Isaac, "God hath provided," he had one meaning, viz. that Isaac was the lamb provided; in the sequel he saw another provision made, and then he called the place "Jehovah hath provided," in a sense quite different from the meaning of his reply to Isaac. But, did he mean, merely, that Jehovah, the mediating God, had provided a *ram* to take the place of Isaac on the altar? Surely not. That interpretation falls infinitely below the solemn grandeur, and far reaching import of the transaction.

It is evident, that at some period in Abraham's life, he had a special discovery of the way of salvation by the great atoning sacrifice for sin. "Abraham," says our Saviour, "rejoiced to see my day; he saw it and was glad. When was it that Abraham had this discovery? His obedience was now complete, he had acted in his measure, the part of

---

"Locum vero illum vocavit; Jova Jireh (Jova providebit). quae etiamnum in proverbio dicitur: 'In monte Jova (Jeræh) providebitur.'" And the reply of Abraham to Isaac, in verse eight, he translates: "Deus sibi providebit agnum sacrifici." A decided improvement on the English version and the Septuagint.

God in giving his son to die, he stood on the spot on which the Son of God was to be lifted up for the sins of the world, mercy interposed to stay the sword of justice, the Angel Jehovah provides mercy by substitution, where Elohim had only provided suffering. The place was not named "JEHOVAH HATH PROVIDED," merely to commemorate the providing of a ram in the place of Isaac. That name referred to "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world—to the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." When Abraham saw this glorious provision of mercy, revealed in a transaction which stirred his soul to its profoundest depths, he could not speak of it as something yet to be, it was a perfect plan, in the Divine counsels, he could not say of that scheme of mercy, "God *will* provide," the plan was already perfect, and its fulfilment sure, he must say of that, "God *hath* provided."

To return then to our propositions: it is not necessary for us to prove that the sense and scope of the passage *require* that *Elohim Jireh* have the meaning of past, or perfect tense in verse eight. For, as we have shown, that there is no grammatical objection to that construction, and that the usage of the word is in its favor, the burden of proof is on the other side. Does the sense and scope of the passage require the *future* tense? If not, our point is conceded. Is any one prepared to maintain that the words "God *will* provide" are the proper expression of a perfect faith? Whoever undertakes to defend that rendering must tell us what Abraham meant by those words. Was his answer to Isaac a known falsehood, an equivocation, or a prophecy? We have shown, as we think, conclusively, that the expression "God *hath* provided," is both sincere, and truthful, and the true language of a soul wholly resigned to the Divine will, rendering unquestioning obedience, even to the sacrifice of the dearest object of the heart's affections.

If then, it be conceded, that "*Elohim Jireh*," verse eight, means, "God *hath* provided," it follows, without question, that "*Jehovah Jireh*," in verse fourteen, means, "Jehovah *hath* provided." We have seen that this is the only render-

ing which meets the obvious necessities of the passage. No other rendering can do it. The only difficulty, then, that remains, is the pointing of the two words רָאָה and הַר. We shall not argue this point further, but let every one draw his own conclusions from the facts. The pointing leads to difficulties greater, as it seems to us than the rejection. Is there any evidence that this place was called "the mount of the Lord?" That title was given to Horeb. And then, how incongruous to translate the word *Jireh* in senses so diverse, in the same sentence, where it is manifest that the meaning in one part is intended to explain the meaning in the other? For, if *Jehovah Jireh* means *will provide*, then the other *Jireh* means *provide* also. In that case we should have the sentence thus, "Abraham called the name of that place *Jehovah will provide*, whence the proverb, to this day, in the mount of *Jehovah* it was provided. At any rate, it belongs to those who maintain the correctness of the pointing to give it a consistent explanation.

Abraham is held forth in the Scriptures, as the true type of a man of faith under the Patriarchal Dispensation. He reached the same goal that believers in Christ reach, but by a different process. It is the peculiar privilege of the believer in Jesus to *begin* his life of faith by the new birth, by regeneration and spiritual life. It is his privilege to be "created in Christ Jesus unto good works." But in the case of Abraham, "faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect."—James ii: 22. Abraham is named among those who, "having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."—Heb. xi: 39—40. It was only after long time, and many struggles and severe trials, that he obtained the testimony which believers in Christ obtain the moment that they become believers. After walking threescore years in the unwavering belief that "God is, and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him," after showing his willingness to offer up his only Son, the child of promise

on the altar, he then saw the Messiah's day, and rejoiced with exceeding joy. He named the place of his trial, "Jehovah hath provided," and this name became the watchword of the people of God. The story of Abraham's fearful trial, of his faithful obedience, his unexpected deliverance, his discovery of the glorious plan of salvation in the type of his own son, his naming of the place in commemoration of the type and the anti-type, was handed down from sire to son, it became a household word in the camp of Israel, it lighted up the long and dreary captivity in Egypt, it was in the pillar of the cloud by day and of the fire by night, it spoke in the symbol of the Ark of the Covenant, it was the bow of promise, that "in the mount Jehovah hath provided." In the darkest hour of trial, in the night of weeping, in the chambers of affliction, in the hour of death, the story of Abraham was the pledge of mercy. By the light of this example, they could be assured that the mount of expected sorrow would be the place of deliverance and of joy. With this assurance, they could sing with us:

"God moves in a mysterious way,  
His wonders to perform;  
He plants his footsteps in the sea,  
And rides upon the storm.

Deep in unfathomable mines,  
Of never failing skill,  
He treasures up his bright designs,  
And works his secret will.

Blind unbelief is sure to err,  
And scan His work in vain;  
God is his own interpreter,  
And He will make it plain."

The writer will simply add, that the views of this very important and instructive passage in the spiritual training of the great father of the faithful above presented, are the results of his own limited studies, and his reflections thereon. Whether any other writer has taken the same view of the meaning of those words, he is unable to say. He has neither the time nor the opportunity to consult the works of writers on the Hebrew text. The question is now submitted to the judgment of those better prepared to establish the meaning on a philological basis.

ART. II.—THE PHÆDON: OR. PLATO ON THE  
IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

PLATO, says Coleridge, was a divine philosopher, a plank from the wreck of Paradise, thrown on the shores of idolatrous Greece. In our estimate of Plato, the sentiment embodied in Coleridge's metaphor must be kept in view. He that studies Plato, should not forget that Plato was of our own degenerate race ; that he was not a Jew, with Moses and Isaiah and David to guide him, but a Greek, with not a page, probably, of authoritative instruction upon the relation of man to God. Plato traveled to Italy, to Cyrene, to Egypt. O that he had gone to one other land, farther toward the sun-rising, and there bathed his soul in the brightest beams that then shone upon the world, and caught beforehand some glances from that sun, which, though it was not to rise for four hundred years, sent even then a mellowed light over Palestine! Then would he have given us a better argument upon the immortality of the soul. Less ingenious it had been, because more simple: less of Plato it had showed, but more of truth. Yet dim as was the light that shone on Plato, the PHÆDON is a wonderful production, still worthy the attention of every Christian minister.

We propose to give, abbreviated, the contents of the work, to notice the recent New York edition of Stanford's Translation, and to inquire into the merit of the Phædon as an argument. We disclaim ability to execute this purpose in such a manner, as shall be particularly instructive to those whose profession is the study of the Classics. We propose to do the best we can in consistency with the ordinary duties of a Christian pastor. The original text which we have used is that of the Leipsic edition of 1825, with the Annotations of Wytténbach.

The most general analysis that can be given of the Phædon is this: Why the true Philosopher will rejoice to die:

the soul is immortal. The latter is the main point: the former is preliminary. A fuller analysis may be of some service in preparing the reader to follow the thread of the argument. The true philosopher will rejoice to die. Why? For two reasons: 1. He cares little for the body; 2. He desires to attain wisdom, which is impossible without a separation of the soul from the body. But suppose the body to have died, does the soul continue to exist? We may believe that it does, and this for the following reasons: I. The old tradition that the soul pre-exists; II. The nature of the soul. That the soul pre-exists is argued, first, from the doctrine of contraries; secondly, from the doctrine of reminiscence. To these arguments two objections are started: 1. That the soul may be nothing but harmony, and, therefore, may perish upon the destruction of the instrument from which it is produced; 2. That the soul, though it may wear out several bodies, may perish at last. To each of these objections is made an extended reply. Then follow two practical thoughts suggested by the discussion: the one pertaining to the great care which the soul demands, and the other to a future retribution. In the latter is embraced a detailed description of the earth and hell.

The number of characters which appear in the dialogue is eight. There are two sets of characters: the one present, if we may so say, the other not present. Phædo, whose name the Dialogue bears, meeting Echecrates, narrates the last day's interview which he and others had held with Socrates in prison. These, therefore, are, strictly speaking, on the foreground of the picture; yet, by a wonderful power in the artist, they soon take their places on the background; Socrates the aged, Simmias and Cebes, who are young men, coming forward and retaining their places to the last. Apollodorus, Crito, and the officer of the prison, are the three other characters. What Plato puts into the mouth of Socrates, Simmias and Cebes, Apollodorus, Crito, and officer of prison, is represented as narrated by Phædo to Echecrates. Plato was not himself present: he was ill—a fact overlooked by the writer of the biography of Plato in Anthon's Classi-

cal Dictionary. During the progress of the Dialogue, Phædo and Echecrates occasionally re-appear, but so graphic is Phædo's narration, that we are transported, whether we will be or not, to the prison, where we hear the wisest and the best man in all Greece discoursing upon some of the profoundest truths that can engage the human mind, and where we see him drink the fatal cup and lie down to die. We are now prepared to break this box of Grecian wisdom.

Phædo, assuring Echecrates that he was personally present when Socrates drank the poison, explains the cause of the uncommon length of time between the trial and the execution. Echecrates is anxious to receive a distinct account of all that was said or done on the last day of Socrates' life. Phædo is quite at leisure, and will be most happy to tell him. He proceeds, therefore, to say, that so calm and noble was the bearing of Socrates, he was not himself so affected as would seem to be natural. He and his companions were both sad and joyful, sometimes laughing and sometimes weeping. He states the names of all who were present, making express mention of the absence of Plato.

Entering the prison, he says, we found Socrates to have been just unbound, and Xantippe—for you know her—sitting near with her little son. Seeing us, Xantippe cried out and spoke as women are wont to speak: "Your friends, Socrates, converse with you now for the last time." Socrates, looking to Crito, requested that some one might lead her home. Some of Crito's attendants led her away bawling and beating herself. And Socrates, sitting up in bed, bent his leg, and rubbing it with his hand, made a passing remark or two respecting the connection of pleasure and pain. It seems to me, he said, that if Æsop had turned his attention to this matter, he would have composed a fable to the effect, that the Deity, wishing to effect a reconciliation between those contending principles, and failing in the attempt, joined their heads together, so that he who has the one must soon have the other.

Socrates, as we have already seen in the analysis, argued the IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, *first*, upon the ground of *the old tradition that the soul pre-exists*.

The pre-existence of the soul may be proved, first, by *the doctrine of contraries*. Socrates affirmed that, taking a comprehensive view of things, we shall find that whatever is of such a nature as to admit an opposite quality, arises from a contrary. Greater arises from less, less from greater, weaker from stronger, swifter from slower, worse from better, juster from unjust. He affirmed that in all such cases there are two stages of generation, or becoming; the process being first from one to another, and then from this back again to that. Cold, for example, becomes warm—the first stage of generation; then warm becomes cold—the second stage. So life has its contrary—death. Here, then, there must be two stages of generation.\* Waking comes from sleeping, and then sleeping comes from waking. So death comes from life—the first stage. Hence the contrary or second stage—life from death. Then the living are produced from the dead, no less than the dead from the living. If the living are produced from the dead, it follows, of necessity, that the souls of the deceased exist somewhere, whence they return to life.

Socrates strengthened the argument by the consideration that were there no such alternation in nature, no such circuit, production would entirely cease, and all things would become the same. This he illustrates as follows: If sleeping had no contrary, we should find the fable of Endymion nonsense, and Endymion† not entitled to any special pre-eminence; for we should all alike sleep, never to wake.

Socrates argued the pre-existence of the soul; further, from *the doctrine of reminiscence*. After the manner of Plato, this new argument is started not by Socrates, but by Cebes; yet by Cebes not as his own, but as something which he had been accustomed to hear from Socrates himself. Mark how Simmias rings changes, sportively, upon the word remember. But, Cebes, said Simmias in reply, *remind* me what are the proofs of this, for I do not now very well *remember*.

---

\* Two sets of changes.

† In Grecian Mythology, Endymion gained the love of the goddess Selene, and she bore him fifty daughters. For this, as some say, Jupiter granted him the boon of perpetual sleep.

Cebes, as many other young men would have done, dispatched the matter very quickly, his confidence and self-praise forming a striking contrast with the humility of Socrates.

Socrates, without expressing his opinion of the value of Cebes' argument, gently proceeded to reason thus: He that remembers must have had previous knowledge of what he remembers. The law of association or suggestion—to adopt the language of modern philosophy—implies the doctrine of reminiscence. When lovers see a lyre or a garment, they form in the mind an image of the girl to whom the lyre belongs. This is reminiscence. Reminiscence arises partly from resemblance and partly from contrast. We are accustomed in the former case, to institute a comparison between the object before us and that which is remembered. Take as an illustration the abstract idea of equality. This abstract notion was suggested by seeing two equal things, say two stones, or two logs. The idea of equality and two equal logs or stones, are totally distinct. As he that remembers must have had previous knowledge of what he remembers, we must have had the idea of equality before we perceived that objects, though appearing to be equal fell short of the ideal. But this perception came through the senses. We must, therefore, have had the abstract idea of equality before we perceived by the senses that objects were more or less equal. But we exercise our senses immediately after our birth. We must, therefore, have had the idea of equality before we were born.

This idea of equality was employed by Socrates to illustrate things more important. For the same reason that we must have had the idea of equality before we were born, we must have had the idea of the beautiful, the good, the just and the holy; in fine, of all things which have a real existence.\* Though we had this knowledge, yet we lose it, or we should have it at birth. One of two things is certain; either we are all born in possession of this knowledge, and retain it through life, or learning it afterwards, we do

---

\* *i. e.*, of essences.

nothing but remember. But our souls have not attained to this knowledge since we were born into the world. They attained to it before. Our souls, therefore, existed before they appeared in our present human form. If abstract ideas, Socrates admitted, do not exist, the argument is of no value; if these have no existence, then our souls had no existence before birth.

Simmias, being very confident that abstract ideas do exist, acknowledged the point proved.

"And how does it appear to Cebes?" said Socrates, "for it is necessary to convince Cebes also." "Sufficiently proved to him," said Simmias, "so far as I can judge; though he is the most obstinate of men in his resistance of arguments. Still I think he has not failed of being persuaded of this, that our souls existed before we were born?"

Simmias himself, however, as well as Cebes, thought that only one half had yet been proved. We may have lived before birth; but shall we live after death?—that is the question. Socrates thought that this argument from reminiscence, combined with that from the doctrine of contraries, does prove it. How? If, he argued, the soul existed before our birth, and if, upon coming into life it can be produced from no other source than from death and from being dead, how is it possible that it does not exist after death, since it must be again produced?

"What is now said, has, therefore, been proved. Still both you and Simmias seem to me as if you would gladly examine the subject further, and as if you were fearing, like children, lest, on the departure of the soul from the body, the wind should indeed scatter and drive it away; very especially should one happen to die, not in a calm, but in some great wind."

This made Cebes laugh, and he admitted, half seriously and half sportively, that perhaps there was something of the child within them that made them fear death. The reply of Socrates was very beautiful: "But you must sing to it every day, till you shall have charmed\* it away."

---

\* Readings differ. The text of the Leipsic edition of 1825, gives *εξιασηται*, which would require us to translate, *till you have entirely cured it*. The editor is very confident that *εξιασηται* is the true reading. We have followed this in our rendering.

We have now arrived at the second general argument; *the nature of the soul*. The first position is taken thus: That which is compounded is likely to be dissolved: that which is simple cannot be dissolved. What then is simple? and what is compound? That which always remains the same,† and in the same condition, is simple: that which is variable and never the same is compound. That which is essence, absolute equality, absolute beauty, and so on, admits of no change whatever: it is a simple, unmixed existence. On the contrary, *things*, such as human beings, horses, garments, and every thing of the sort, are never the same: they are ever changing. The latter can be apprehended by the senses; but the former can be apprehended only by reflection—they are invisible. There are, then, two species of existence, the visible and the invisible; the visible ever changing, the invisible ever the same.

The third position—omitting the second—is as follows: which, as it contains one of Plato's most striking metaphors, we translate nearly in full: It has already been said that when the soul makes use of the senses in prosecuting its investigations, it is forced by the body in the direction of those things which are never the same, wanders about, and becomes distracted, becomes dizzy, as if drunk, because it is engaged upon such matters. On the contrary, when the soul pursues its investigations by itself, in the direction of what is pure, the always being, *ἀεὶ οὐ*, the immortal and immutable, it suffers no distraction, and remains identical with respect to things like itself. Thus again the soul appears to be most closely allied to that which is always the same; but the body resembles that which is not always the same. When body and soul are together, nature enjoins on the body submission, and on the soul authority. Hence

† These phrases, *the same, in the same condition, always the same*, are among Plato's favorite phrases. They are used in contrast with *γίγνομαι*. Those who may desire to become more acquainted with Plato's peculiar use of *εἰμί* and *γίγνομαι*, will find a good *Excursus* upon the subject in Prof. Lewis' edition of *Plato Contra Atheos*. The Dissertation is of great value to a student of the Scriptures.

the soul resembles the Divine, but the body the human. From all these considerations, it is evident that the soul bears the strongest resemblance to that which is Divine, immortal, intelligible,\* unmixed, indissoluble, always the same; but that the body is most like that which is human, and mortal, and diverse, and capable of dissolution. Hence it is likely that the soul is altogether indissoluble, or very near to it.

Socrates is made to teach very distinctly the doctrine of future punishment. Though badly mixed up with the doctrine of transmigration, yet it shews how deeply lodged in the human mind is the idea, that some sort of punishment awaits the wicked after death. Asses, wolves, hawks, kites, bees, wasps, ants, are some of the forms into which sinners are driven. Those who have given themselves to the study of philosophy, abstaining from the gratification of the bodily appetites, not fearing the loss of property, indifferent to the disgrace of a low estate—these alone come into the race of the gods. The study and practice of philosophy—by which is meant the cultivation of the reason, instead of the gratification of the senses—is all that can fit men for the future life.

The direct argument closed, Simmias and Cebes fell into conversation, while Socrates seemed to be meditating upon the subject discussed.

“What,” said Socrates at length, “do you think of the matter? If you are engaged in considering any other subject, I have nothing to say; but if you are in doubt respecting these things, do not shrink from speaking and making a thorough statement.” Simmias acknowledged that both he and Cebes had doubts, but very kindly suggested that it might not be agreeable to him in his present distress to discourse longer on the subject. “Bless me!” said Socrates, smiling, “it would be difficult to convince other men that I do not regard my present lot as a calamity, since I cannot convince even you.” He then proceeded to discourse very beautifully upon the dying swan, that is said to sing most joyfully in death; calling himself a fellow servant of the swans, and affirming that he departs from life not more despondingly than they. He encouraged them, therefore, to speak, and to ask whatever they chose. “In regard to such matters,” said Simmias, “it is necessary to effect one at least of these things; either ourselves to learn how they are, or to discover them by means of others; or, if this is impossible, then at least having taken of human reasons the

---

\* We have condensed this admirable specimen of reasoning.

best and the hardest to refute, and sailing upon this as upon a raft, to take the risk of navigating through life, unless one could go through more safely and less dangerously upon a firmer support, or **SOME DIVINE REASON.**"

We pause to say a word upon this remarkable passage. Simmias here implies the impossibility of arriving at a perfectly satisfactory conclusion in respect to the momentous subject of the soul's immortality. Get the best of human reasons possible, and yet you cannot be sure that you are right. We are to take the risk of navigating through life with the best human reasons we can find, unless one can meet with some *Divine reason*,  $\lambda\circ\gamma\circ\sigma\circ\theta\circ\iota\circ\sigma\circ$ . What was this Divine reason? Professor Lewis, with many others, seems to incline to the opinion, that Plato was here anticipating the possibility of a written revelation. Wyttenbach, however, in his Annotation upon the place, cautions us against seeking in the words any mysterious meaning. It is not to be applied, he says, to a written revelation, the Greek  $\lambda\circ\gamma\circ\sigma\circ$  signifying both *ratio* and *oratio*. The same phrase, he adds, was used before Plato by Heraclitus, and is found in a noble Orphic Fragment. Plutarch, also, it appears, imitates this place in the Phædon in the phrase  $\theta\circ\iota\circ\sigma\circ\delta\circ\gamma\circ\mu\circ\alpha$ . On the whole, however delightful it might be to regard Plato as here having an intuitive perception of the possibility of a written revelation, yet we should not be justified, probably, in indulging the opinion.

Encouraged by Socrates, Simmias and Cebes stated, each, their objections. Simmias objected that the soul may be nothing but a kind of *harmony*, which would necessarily be lost as soon as the instrument perishes out of which the harmony had been produced. Cebes objected, that the soul, after dwelling in several bodies may perish at last.

At this point in the Dialogue, Plato makes Phædo and Echecrates re-appear. Phædo tells Echecrates that these objections,—which are stated in the Dialogue at considerable length,—very unpleasantly affected all who were listening; disturbing their minds after they seemed to have been settled.

"By the gods," says Echecrates. "I pardon you; for a similar thought

comes to myself as I hear you. Tell me, then, by Jupiter, how Socrates met the argument; and whether he also, like yourselves, was manifestly disturbed, or whether he came mildly to the rescue of the argument; and whether he came to the rescue ably or imperfectly." "In truth, Echechrates, often as I have admired Socrates, I never was more delighted than to be with him then. That he had something to say was perhaps not at all surprising, but I at least did especially wonder at him, at the first, on this account—how sweetly, and mildly, and applaudingly, he answered the argument of the young man; then, how keenly he perceived the manner in which we were affected by the argument; then, how well he healed us, and recalled us fleeing and worsted, and urged us to accompany him in a consideration of the subject."

"How, indeed?" inquires Echechrates. "I will tell you," says Phædo; "for I was sitting upon his right hand, near the bed, upon a low seat, but he was sitting considerably higher than I. Stroking my head, and grasping closely the hair upon my neck—for he was accustomed to joke me sometimes upon my hair—he said: 'To-morrow, then, Phædo, you will perhaps cut off those beautiful locks.' " "It is probable, Socrates," said I. "Not, surely, if you will take my advice." "But what then?" said I. "To-morrow," he replied, "both I mine and you these, if indeed our argument shall have perished, and we shall have not been able to resuscitate it. And if I were you, and the argument were escaping me, I would swear, like the Argives, not to let my hair grow till, fighting over again the argument of Simmias and Cebes, I had gained the victory."

Socrates having reminded them of the danger of becoming haters of reasoning, as some become haters of men, and urging them not to admit into the soul the idea that, perhaps, there is nothing sound in reasoning, and advising them to give little heed to Socrates, but much to the truth, proceeded to reply to the objection of Simmias, that the soul may be nothing but a kind of harmony, liable to be lost as soon as the instrument is destroyed by means of which it is produced.

First, he made Simmias contradict himself thus:

"You admit the argument from reminiscence?" "Yes." "Then you admit that the soul existed somewhere before it was imprisoned in the body?" "Yes." "But you will not assert that the harmony existed prior to the instrument from which it flows?" "By no means." "But you have just admitted that the soul exists before the body, for you have admitted the argument from reminiscence. Your propositions, then, do not agree. Your argument about harmony is not harmonious. Which of your propositions do you prefer?" \* "That which pertains to reminiscence," replied Simmias.

Again: "Harmony cannot be otherwise affected than are the materials from which it is produced. It cannot take the lead, but must follow. It

---

\*We have condensed this admirable specimen of reasoning.

cannot in any respect be opposed to the materials which produce it. Harmony depends on arrangement according to the laws of harmony. The more perfect the adaptation to the laws of harmony, the fuller and richer is the harmony; the less perfect the adaptation, the more inferior the harmony. But can one soul be more or less a soul than another soul? No. But one soul may be virtuous and intelligent, and another soul may be vicious and ignorant? Yes. But if the soul is a harmony, what are virtue and vice? Is virtue harmony? and thus does the soul which you affirm to be harmony, contain a second harmony? Is vice discord?—discord in harmony! But it has already been admitted that one soul is not more or less a soul than another, which is equivalent to saying that harmony cannot admit of degrees of efficiency. One soul, then, cannot partake of more harmony or discord than another. If, then, vice is discord and virtue is harmony, how can one soul be more virtuous or more vicious than another? Harmony is harmony, and therefore if the soul is nothing but harmony, vice is impossible."

Again: "Is it not the soul that either resists or yields to the appetites? But have we not already admitted that the soul, if a harmony, cannot breathe any other tones than those of the materials from which it is produced?" "We did admit it," said Simmias; "for how is it possible not to admit it?" "What then?" said Socrates. "Does not the soul seem to us to work entirely opposite, controlling all those qualities of which one might say it consists, and making an almost entire opposition through the whole of life, ruling with absolute sway all habits; chastising some more severely, even with pains according to the gymnastic and healing arts, and others more mildly, and sometimes threatening and sometimes warning the desires, the angry passions, and the fears, as if the soul, one thing, were reasoning with another thing?—something as Homer represents it in the *Odyssey*, when he speaks of Ulysses: 'And, striking his breast, he reproved his soul with words.—Bear up, heart! Even worse hast thou once borne.' Do you think that Homer represented this with the opinion that the soul is a harmony, capable of being led by the passions of the body, but not capable of leading and mastering these, and of being something much more divine than harmony?" "By Jupiter, Socrates, I at least do not think so." "Not by any means, then, most excellent friend, is it well to say that the soul is a kind of harmony."

Having answered Simmias, Socrates directed himself to Cebes. "How and by what kind of reasoning shall we satisfy him?" "It appears to me," said Cebes, "that you will discover some way; at least this argument against the harmony you have spoken, is amazingly contrary to my expectations." "My good friend," said Socrates, "don't talk big, lest some slander turn upside down the argument which is about to be spoken."

Socrates affirmed that the inquiry of Cebes involves the absolute necessity of discussing the origin of generation and corruption. By generation, it may here be remarked once for all, Plato means *becoming*. Socrates, then, affirmed that it was necessary to ascertain how things *become*, and how things return to corruption. He proposed, therefore, to relate his attempts to become informed upon the subject:

When a young man, he was extremely fond of that kind of wisdom which is called inquiry respecting nature; [φυσις,]

or, as we say, natural science. He puzzled himself with such questions as these: whether, when heat and cold have taken on some corruption, as some affirm,—whether it is just then that living beings assume consistency? and whether it is the blood by which we think, or the air, or the fire; or none of these, but that it is the brain that produces the sensations of hearing, and sight, and smell. He once thought he knew all about these and similar matters. "But now," said Cebes, "what do you think about them?" "Far am I, by Jupiter," said Socrates, "from thinking that I know the cause of any of these things." At length, however, he fell in with Anaxagoras' book, and when he found Anaxagoras treating of MIND, [*νοῦς*,] as the regulator and ground of all things, he was delighted to think that he had found an instructor to his mind. But he was doomed to disappointment, for he found that Anaxagoras' theory was never practically applied by the philosopher himself. Anaxagoras forsook his own theory, and never used it to explain whether the earth was flat or round. He could not expect, therefore, to get help from Anaxagoras respecting the relative position of the earth, and respecting the sun, moon and planets.

His next attempt was of a very different kind.

"Do you wish Cebes," said he, "that I would describe to you the second voyage which I made for the discovery of the ground of things?"\* "Most wonderfully do I desire it," replied Cebes. "It seemed to me then, afterwards," Socrates resumed, "when I had given up the investigation of *things*, that it was necessary to beware lest I should suffer what those suffer who gaze at and contemplate an eclipse of the sun; for some destroy their eyes unless they contemplate an image of it in the water, or in something of that sort. Something of this kind did I also think, and feared lest my soul should become entirely blinded, after looking at things with the eyes, and attempting to grasp them with each of the senses. Now I thought that I should flee to *the reasons*†, to consider, in them, the truth of things."

\* The great metaphysical question in all times. See, as the most recent, that masterly discussion of it in Prof. Ferrier's **INSTITUTES OF METAPHYSICS**.

† These *λόγοι* or reasons, which play so conspicuous a part in the remainder of the Dialogue, and which we find also in **THE TENTH BOOK OF THE LAWS**, probably refer, in part, at least, to the relation of numbers to each other. These are not cognizable by the senses. They belong entirely to the province of the understanding.

Socrates laid down this as a general principle; that there is such a ground of the existence of things as ABSTRACT IDEAS. He contended that there is such a thing as beauty in the abstract, goodness in the abstract, greatness in the abstract, &c., &c. This granted—and Cebes readily granted it—he proposed to demonstrate the immortality of the soul. If any thing is beautiful, he argued, it is beautiful for no other reason than because it partakes of the abstract idea of beauty: so of greatness and smallness. This he illustrated in the following manner:

"Would you say that the ground of the existence of ten is this; that it is more than eight by two? Would you say that the ground of the existence of two cubits, is the fact that two cubits are more by half than one cubit? When one has been added to one, would you not hesitate to say that the addition is the ground of being two? or the division, when it has been divided? Is not the ground of that which exists, *the abstract quality of which it partakes?*"

Again re-appear Phædo and Echebrates. "By Jupiter," says Echebrates to Phædo, "he seems to me to have explained this with amazing clearness, even to one of very little intelligence." "And it seemed entirely so," says Phædo, "to all who were present." "To us, also," adds Echebrates, "who were absent, but are now listening: but what more was said after this?"

Socrates, it appears, reminded Simmias and Cebes that greatness is not great and small at the same time; that greatness retires on the approach of the small, or ceases to exist when it has come; that smallness is not small and great at the same time, but on the approach of the great smallness retires or comes to an end.

Some one, Phædo says, but who he does not recollect, here exclaimed:

"By the gods, was not the very opposite of what is now said admitted in the former part of the conversation?—that the greater comes from the less, and the less from the greater?"

"Contraries from contraries, Plato did indeed teach us at first to prove the immortality of the soul. Why, to prove the same, does he now teach that greatness retires from the small, and smallness from the great?"

Let Plato, through Socrates, extricate himself: he can do it. Socrates denied that there was any contradiction between the two views; for, before, he was saying that one *thing* comes from another *thing*: now he is affirming that contrariety itself, [i. e., the abstract idea,] cannot be con-

trary to itself. Essences he never affirmed to be capable of mutual production—generation.

All this and more in the same strain, may seem to us to have no possible relation to the point to be proved, the immortality of the soul ; but, if we are patient, we shall soon see that Plato was here marching on the Mac-adamized road of Metaphysics, straight to the point. He takes another step forward. Socrates called the attention of Simmias and Cebes to the abstract, heat and cold, and to the concrete, snow and fire. Heat, the abstract, is different from fire ; and cold, the abstract, is different from snow. Now snow retires when heat approaches : it cannot continue to be snow and at the same time be hot. It is the same with fire. Respecting some of these things, it would seem, then, that not only the same *idea* is always thought worthy of the same name, but that also something else is thought worthy of it ; though this is not that, but has always the form of that, as soon as it has an actual form. To illustrate ; take the number *three*. Three and odd are not the same thing ; and yet three, while it must always be designated by its name *three*, may also be called *odd*. In other words, though three is not the same as the odd, yet it is always odd.

One step more : not only do contraries appear not to receive each other, [as greatness, smallness, snow, heat,] but things which, though not contraries, yet sustain a very intimate relation to contraries. Three and two, for example, are not contraries ; yet three would perish before it would consent to become even, as two is.

How shall this class of things be described ? Thus : all such things are obliged to retain not only their own distinctive idea, but also another idea which is in its very nature. For example ; whatever the idea of three may have occupied, must be not only three but also odd. Odd can never be even. Even can never be odd. Three can have no share in the even : therefore three is uneven.

Now it is the soul which makes a body a living body. The soul, then, always brings life. But life has its contrary—death. The soul can never admit this contrary, be-

cause it always opposes to death the life which it brings. Now, we call that immortal which does not admit death. The soul, therefore, is immortal; just as three can never be even, nor the odd be even, nor fire cold. On the approach of death to man, that which is mortal dies; but that which is immortal, having withdrawn from death, departs safe and incorrupt. Here the argument rested.

Plato seldom reasons for the sake of reasoning. He cannot, therefore, close the Dialogue, without giving a practical direction to his thoughts. "But this, O man," said he, "it is just to consider, that if indeed the soul is immortal, it surely demands care, not merely for this period of time, which we call life, but for the entire period of our existence; and the danger would now assuredly seem to be exceedingly terrible, should one neglect it. If, indeed, death were a deliverance from every thing, it would be a lucky thing,\* for the wicked to be let off from the body and from their wickedness at the same time the soul is released; but now, since the soul appears to be immortal, no other escape from wickedness could there be, neither salvation, except in attaining to the highest possible degree of wisdom and goodness. For the soul descends to the place of the departed with nothing else than the result of its training and mode of life; which, moreover, are said to be of the greatest advantage or injury to the dying man, immediately, at the very outset of his journey thither. The soul that has led a pure and moderated life, goes, with God as fellow travelers and guides, to a place adapted to itself."

Having thus touched upon the doctrine of retribution, Socrates proceeded to give a detailed description of the earth, for the purpose of bringing out with more distinctness the terrible consequences of sin. His description, partly mythological and partly speculative, contains much error and some truth. Though it forms a very curious part of the Dialogue, our limits oblige us to pass it by. We cannot forbear to say, however, that Socrates was convinced, in the

---

\* A real windfall, as we say.

first place, that if the earth is round, in the centre of the heavens, neither air nor any thing else of that nature is necessary to prevent its falling ; but the similarity of the heavens all around it and the equilibrium of the earth itself was surely sufficient to sustain it. For any thing in equilibrium, placed in the middle of something like it, cannot incline more or less to any side, but being alike, remains unmoved. Of this, in the first place, Socrates affirmed that he was fully persuaded.

“Besides, I am fully persuaded,” he said, “that the earth is very great ; and that we are living in a small portion of it, extending only from Phasis to the pillars of Hercules, dwelling around the sea\* as ants or frogs around a marsh.†

We must give Phædo’s graphic report of the final scene.

“But, O Simmias,” said Socrates, “it is necessary for the reasons that we have considered, to leave no stone unturned,‡ that we may acquire, during life, virtue and wisdom ; *for beautiful is the prize and the hope is great.*§ To insist that it is just as I have described, becometh not a man of intelligence. That, however, either these or similar views should be taken respecting our souls and their habitations—this, since the soul certainly appears to be immortal, seems to me to be proper, and worth the risk to him who thinks so. The hazard is honorable, *and it is fitting to sing*, as it were, *such things to himself*. You, then, Simmias and Cebes, and the others, will at some future time, each one depart ; but as to myself, destiny, as a tragic poet would say, is calling me, and the time has well nigh come when I should go to the bathing room ; for it seems better to bathe before I drink the poison, and so save the women the trouble of washing the corpse.”

“How shall we bury you ?” asked Crito. “As you please,” said he, “if you can only take me, and I do not escape from you.” How keen the irony ! How cutting the rebuke for asking how they should bury him, instead of asking how they should bury his body ! “Let not Crito,” he added, “say at my burial, that *Socrates* is laid out, or carried forth, or buried. For be assured, most excellent Crito, that not to express ourselves well, is not only to be out of tune in itself, but is a cause of mischief to our souls. It is necessary, then, to take heart and to direct you to bury my *body*, [not myself, is the implication.] and to bury it in such a manner as may be agreeable to you ; and especially in such a manner as you may judge to be according to the law.”

\* The Mediterranean.

† We are told that Celsus imitated this in venting his spleen against Jews and Christians. Laughing at Jews and Christians; he likened them, says Origen, to a chain of bats; or to ants crawling forth from their homes; or to frogs sitting together around a marsh; or worms assembling in muddy corners.

We are indebted for this illustration to the Latin note in the Leipsic edition of the Phædon already referred to.

‡ πάντα ποτε.

§ The Greek is very beautiful : *καλον γας το αδην, και η ειπις μεγαλη.*

Upon saying this, continues Phædo, he rose up to go into a chamber to bathe, Crito following him; but he directed us to wait for him. We remained, therefore, conversing among ourselves respecting what had been said, reviewing it, and speaking of the greatness of our calamity, fully of the opinion that, as if deprived of a father, we should pass through the rest of life orphans. After he had bathed, and his little children were brought to him,—for he had two small sons and one large one,—and his female relatives had arrived, he, having conversed with them in the presence of Crito, and having given them such directions as he chose, commanded the women and the children to depart, and himself came to us.

It was now near sunset; for he had delayed a long time within. Coming from the bath, he sat down, and not much more after this was said. The officer of the Eleven then came, and standing near him, said:

"Socrates, I shall not reproach you as I reproach others because they abuse and curse me, when, under the constraint of rulers, I order them to drink the poison. I have found you, indeed at other times as well as now, the noblest, and gentlest, and best of all the men that ever came hither; and, moreover, I do even now well know that you do not think hard of me, but of them:—for you know who are to blame. Now, therefore,—for you know what I have come to announce,—farewell; and try to bear as easily as possible what is inevitable." And, instantly bursting into tears, he turned and went away. Socrates, looking up to him, said: "You, too, farewell! We shall do as you direct." At the same time he said to us: "How urbane the man! He has been accustomed to visit me through the whole time, and has occasionally entered into conversation. He was the most agreeable of men, and now how nobly he weeps for me! But come now, Crito, let us obey him, and let some one bring the poison, if it has been ground, but if not, let the man grind it." "But I think, Socrates," replied Crito, "that the sun is yet upon the mountains, not yet having set. Besides I know that others drink the poison very late, after the order has been given, supping and drinking freely, and some holding converse with those they love. Hasten not, then, for there is yet time." "Naturally, Crito," said Socrates, "do they act so, for they think by so doing they shall gain, and I naturally shall not do so; for I think I should gain nothing else, surely, by drinking a little later, than to bring laughter to myself by shewing that I was eager to live, and was disposed to relinquish nothing that is yet within my reach. But go," said he, "and do not otherwise."

Upon hearing this, Crito beckoned to a servant that stood near. The boy having gone out and remained a long time, returned, conducting him who was to administer the poison,

the latter bearing it in a cup, ground. And Socrates, seeing the man, said :

“ Well, most excellent friend, for you are informed upon these points, what must I do ? ” “ Nothing else,” said he, “ than after you have drank, to walk about till your legs become heavy, then lie down, and so the poison will work.”

At the same time he extended the cup to Socrates. Socrates, having taken it, even very cheerfully, Echecrates, not losing either color or countenance, but, as his custom was, giving a stern side-side look at the man, said :

“ What do you say about making a libation of this cup to some one ? lawful or not ? ” “ We grind, Socrates, so much as we think will be sufficient to drink.” “ I understand,” said he, “ but surely it is lawful and expedient to pray to the gods that our removal from this world to the other may be happy.” “ I do indeed pray that this may be so.”

Immediately upon saying this, holding the cup, he drank with great readiness and ease. For a time, the majority of us were barely able to refrain from tears ; but when we saw him finish the draught, we could refrain no longer. Indeed, in spite of myself, the tears flowed not in drops ;\* so that, covering my face, I bewailed myself, not surely for him, but for my own lot, in being deprived of such a friend.

Crito rose up to go sooner than myself, since it was impossible for him to refrain from tears. Apollodorus even before this never ceased to weep, and just then roaring aloud, weeping and grieving, he broke down the heart of every one present, but that of Socrates himself. But Socrates said :

“ What are you doing, my admirable friends ? On this account, chiefly, I sent away the women, that they might not make such false notes.† I have heard, too, that one should die with auspicious words. Be still, indeed, and firm.”

Upon hearing this, we were ashamed, and checked our tears. But he, after walking about, lay down upon his back when his legs grew heavy ; for so the man had directed him. At the same time, the man who had given the poison,

\* *i. e.*, in floods.

† Such discord, *πλημμελοίν*.

taking hold of him, examined after a time his feet and legs, and then pressing hard his foot, asked if he felt it. He said he did not ; and after this again he felt of the legs below the knee. So going up, he shewed us that he was growing cold and stiff. Then he touched himself and said that when it was so, at his heart, then he should depart. Already the region of the lower belly had become cold ; and having uncovered his face—for he had been covered—he said, which were indeed the last words he uttered :

“Crito, we owe a cock to *Æsculapius*; fail not to pay it.” “This shall be done,” said Crito, “but see if there is any thing else you would say.”

When he was asked this, he made no further answer ; but after a little interval he moved, and the man uncovered him. His eyes were fixed, and Crito, observing it, closed the mouth and the eyes.

Such was the death, Echecrates, of our friend ; a man, as we should say, the best of those whom we had then tried, and having, moreover, the greatest practical wisdom and the greatest uprightness.

The direction of Socrates to offer a cock to *Æsculapius*, has long been a stone of stumbling. Some ancient writers consider that the command originated in a desire to disprove the accusation made against him ; for Anytus and Melitus had accused him of saying that there were no gods. We heard, not long since, on the anniversary of a religious society, an excellent sermon, in which the preacher attributed the direction to some remaining superstition. To this we cannot possibly yield our assent. The editor of the Leipzic edition of 1825 says : Since it was customary for the sick, on the recovery of their health, to sacrifice a cock to *Æsculapius*, Socrates commanded this to be done, to indicate that upon the emancipation of his soul from his body, he should gain that health which would be entirely free from earthly evils.

The English translation of this wonderful Dialogue, by Charles S. Stanford, was re-published in New York in 1854. Great pains, the publisher professes, have been taken to select a version calculated to impart the most correct idea of the original, and that in a style likely to find acceptance with the gen-

eral reader. Mr. Stanford's version is pronounced to be a work evincing a masterly acquaintance with both languages, combining a faithful exhibition of the sense of the author, with an uncommon degree of force and elegance in its language.

That it gives a tolerably faithful exhibition of the sense of the author, we have no hesitation in admitting; but the rest of the compliment we judge to be totally undeserved. A perspicuous rendering of the most abstract parts of the *Phædon*, is, to be sure, exceedingly difficult; but Mr. Stanford's Translation is obscure, where, in the original, all is clear. It is exceedingly inelegant. Many of its sentences are stretched out to a length that should extinguish all the indignation which one may have felt toward John Foster for a similar fault in his *Glory of the Age*. He sometimes refreshes us with a sentence that is absolutely pregnant with clauses. Under no conceivable necessity, he pins member to member, member to member, giving us but a single sentence where Plato gives two or three, each clear as crystal. As to characterizing the translation by any of the epithets commonly employed to designate the higher excellencies of style, it is impossible. Rhythm it has none. It hobbles along like a wheel with a broken felly. It overlooks, in innumerable instances, even where our stiff English does not require it, those delicate shades of thought which the Greek particles have such power to express, while it fails also to reproduce some of the finest metaphors in the Dialogue. On the whole, instead of being adapted to find acceptance, as the publisher hopes, with the general reader, we think that if we desired to repress in the general reader all possible interest in Plato, we should put into his hands this "masterly" translation of Mr. Sanford.

To return to Plato himself, *what shall we say of Phædon as an argument?* Cicero, as is well known, was accustomed to read the *Phædon*, and memorable are the words which he uses in describing its effect upon himself: *Nescio quo modo, dum lego, assentior; cum posui librum, et mecum ipse de immortalitate animorum cœpi cogitare, assensio omnis illa elabitur.* Can we say, with Cicero, even as much as this: *Dum lego, assentior?*

All the objects of knowledge may be classified thus: ABSTRACT IDEAS and FACTS. This gives rise to a very obvious distinction in the methods of reasoning; the metaphysical and the inductive. The metaphysical is the method which is to be applied to abstract ideas: the inductive alone is applicable to matters of fact. To which branch of knowledge, then, belongs the immortality of the soul?—to that of abstract ideas? or to that of facts? It is a question of fact. The inductive method, therefore, not the metaphysical, is the only one that should be employed. Plato's great mistake, then, was this: treating the soul's immortality as if it were a question of metaphysics. Had he perceived that it was a question of fact, his method of reasoning would have been totally different.

If the analysis of the *Phædon* which has sometimes been given\* is correct, Plato's method is mixed; partly metaphysical and partly inductive. But we must think that the analysis in question is a mistake. It makes Plato urge five distinct considerations in favor of immortality: 1. The capacity and desire of the soul for knowledge beyond what, in the present life, is attainable; 2. The law of contraries; 3. The doctrine of reminiscence; 4. The simple and indivisible nature of the soul; 5. The essential vitality of the soul. The first, we think, belongs entirely to the preliminary part—why the philosopher should desire to die. It is, we admit, an argument in support of the leading proposition of the Dialogue, but only indirectly so. The leading proposition has not yet been laid down. It is afterwards very distinctly stated, and the first argument as distinctly, which is, that the soul pre-exists. This, which is a question of fact, not of abstract ideas, is argued, metaphysically: 1. From the doctrine of contraries; 2. From the doctrine of reminiscence. What the analysis to which we object regards as the second and the third arguments, we think should be held as the first and the second. What the an-

---

\* See *Bibliotheca Sacra*, February, 1849—Natural Proofs of the Immortality of the Soul, by Professor George I. Chace.

alysis regards as the fourth and the fifth, we prefer to condense into one, which would be our second general argument. This, we think, is clearly stated by Plato himself under the form: *The nature of the soul*. Thoughts of a moral nature are scattered all through the Dialogue, but taking what seems to us to be the correct analysis, the arguments themselves are purely metaphysical. As metaphysical reasoning is totally irrelevant to a question of fact, we must consider the argument of the *Phædon* as a failure. We do not believe that the faith of Plato himself rested upon such a basis. We believe that Plato naturally longed for immortality; and, naturally metaphysical, set himself to work to see what sort of an argument he could construct in support of that which he had been led to believe on other grounds.

Thus it is to be noticed that Plato makes no use of an argument, which, next to the teachings of the Bible, has for some time been the favorite argument of writers and preachers:—the argument drawn from the inequalities of the present life. It is strange that Plato did not employ it; and yet what is the argument worth? Will it take the Almighty a whole eternity to rectify, in each man's case, the alleged evils of twenty-five or eighty years? Cannot the justice which *is said* to be demanded, be rendered in a period equal, say, to ten hundred thousand millions of years? But that is an infinitesimal part of eternity. When justice has been rendered, whether it be at the expiration of ten hundred years, or of ten hundred thousand millions, what will then prevent the annihilation of the soul? We think, therefore, that what is now the popular argument in support of the immortality of the soul, is utterly worthless. Even as a proof that the soul may survive the body, we have never seen it stated as we should prefer. The form in which the argument is commonly put, involves the idea that there is in this world very little moral government. This is arming the skeptic with a terrible weapon. The form which we prefer is this: *The two-fold consideration that this life has so much retribution, yet has no more.*

We are in the shop of a sculptor. We see in a corner of the room a long, rough block of marble. The mere fact that the marble has been delivered at the shop of the artist, awakens the belief that it will yet be chiseled into a statue. We go again: we find the block of marble bearing a few marks of the sculptor's tool. Our belief is strengthened that it is the intention of the artist to bring it into the likeness of an animated being. But our assurance is not perfect; for the sculptor, upon going but a step or two farther, may meet with some defect in the material that will prove it unfit for the purpose. We go yet again, and are delighted to see before us the rough outlines of a man. The general form is complete: the material is proved good. But more labor is necessary to make it a finished statue. The conviction is now well nigh perfect that the artist will bring the work to completion. Let us analyze our faith, and we shall find it based upon this two-fold fact; that so much has been done, yet no more. *So much*: can it be possible, we ask, that one would bring a block of marble into a state so near that of a perfect statue, and there stop? But suppose it to have been brought still nearer to perfection; —so near that but one delicate touch of the chisel is necessary to complete it. It is a touch, however, which not one eye in a million would ever feel the need of, or ever observe if given. Our belief that the statue will ever be brought to that last degree of perfection is weak. It seems to be of so little importance, that we doubt whether the sculptor himself will think it worthy of his notice and effort. There is, then, somewhere, a point at which just so much has been done, and just so much remains to be done, that our faith is the strongest possible that the work will be accomplished. In a word, our belief that the statue will be finished is produced both by its incompleteness and by the degree to which it has already been carried. So, from the two-fold consideration, **THAT THERE IS SO MUCH RETRIBUTION IN THIS LIFE, YET NO MORE**, may we infer, with some degree of probability, that we shall at least survive the death of the body.

In view, however, of the extreme feebleness of all the

natural proofs of the immortality of the soul, we turn with unspeakable delight to the Bible. Never do we feel more deeply the necessity of a written revelation, and never are we more fully and joyfully persuaded that the BIBLE is a revelation, than when we are reading such a work as the Phædon of Plato.

Let all the heathen writers join  
To form one perfect book,  
Great God, if once compared with Thine,  
How mean their writings look !

Not the most perfect rules they gave  
Could shew one sin forgiven,  
Nor lead a step beyond the grave;  
But Thine conduct to heaven.

Yes! Plato, that *λόγος θεός* has been given. Christ hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light. No “risk” do we run in committing ourselves to this new method of sailing through life. FOR WE KNOW that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens. O that we could make all men see the glory of a “book-revelation.”

We had intended to say something upon Plato’s two great mistakes;—locating sin in the body, and enjoining ascetic virtue as the means of securing final happiness. We can do no more, however, than to call special attention to the difference between Plato’s views respecting these points and those which are in Paul’s Epistle to the Romans and in his Epistle to the Galatians: *I am crucified with Christ. Nevertheless, I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me.* Why could not Plato have lived at a period in which it had been possible to hear these wonderful words? *Even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in Thy sight.* The babes know what Plato knew not.

Though these defects in the Platonic theology are so great, and though our philosopher had no idea of the necessity of a Divinely appointed propitiation for sin, we must

never forget that Plato was immeasurably ahead of the popular religion; that in fact he paved the way for the downfall of the existing system; that, with him, virtue, moral government, practical wisdom, retribution, reverence for the Supreme Being, were no unmeaning terms. In fine, we believe that Plato was about as good a theologian as it is possible for one to be who has no written revelation.

Whenever, of late, we have thought of Plato, discouraging to his friends in Athens upon law and virtue, there hath stolen into our minds, sometimes against our will, the name of another, who addresses, every Lord's day, with much rhetorical ability, admiring crowds in "the Athens of America." It were the veriest trifling to suppose that this indissoluble connection of PLATO and PARKER in so many of our rucubrations, is owing to the circumstance that the names of the two theologians begin with the same labial, and have precisely the same number of vowels and consonants. The association must rather depend, we suppose, upon the principle to which Socrates referred in the first of his conversation with Simmias and Cebes:—that the Deity has joined together the heads of pleasure and pain, so that he who has the one must soon have the other.

Theodore Parker, as well as Plato, hath spoken in the ear of the world upon the immortality of the soul. We have had lying by the side of the *Phædon* a pamphlet bearing this title: "A SERMON OF IMMORTAL LIFE: preached at the Melodeon, on Sunday, September 20, 1846. By Theodore Parker, Minister of the Twenty-Eighth Congregational Church in Boston. And now published by request. Fourth edition. Boston: Bela Marsh, 1855." We have endeavored to assume an attitude of perfect impartiality in comparing the philosopher of the Academy with the theologian of the Music Hall. The case, in our minds, stands thus: Plato is himself: Parker starts as an imitator; taking, like the ministers of the Gospel, a text, but not taking it from God's written revelation, and proceeds as an imitator to the close of his discourse. Plato originates: Parker borrows. Plato, granting him his premises,

will draw you with logic mighty as the power of the pulley: Parker is perfectly sophistical in his method of reasoning; his chief skill consisting in stuffing men of straw, and then fighting them with the *argumentum ad captandum*. The basis of Plato's argument is metaphysics: the basis of Parker's is consciousness;—a blunder greater than Plato's. Plato is modest, distrustful of himself: each of Parker's arguments is, in his own judgment, "exceeding powerful," and, "all put together, form a mass of argument which no logic can resist." Parker's own consciousness of immortality is so mighty a proof to himself that he shall live forever, that no miracle could make him more sure. *He* wants no Bible and no Christ to persuade him: Plato talks of the necessity of a *λόγος θεῖος* almost as if he expected a written revelation. Parker cannot think that the future world is to be feared even by the worst of men: Plato thought that if one were to neglect the soul, the danger is great. Plato sends the wicked to hell: Parker takes them all to a heaven. Plato lays broad and deep the foundation of personal excellence: Parker saps the very foundation of morals by telling men infamous for their crimes, that they become infamous through no fault of theirs; that they are not sinners before God, and that the pirate in heaven will outgrow his earthly sins. Plato has done better without the Bible than Parker with it. Plato wrote to save men from hell: Parker has written to tell men that there is no hell. When we can say with Theodore Parker, We ask no miracle, no proof, no risen dust, to teach us immortality, then we shall take Plato for our guide rather than Parker. We prefer Paul to either.

## ART. III.—UNITARIANISM.

1. *Scripture Proofs and Scriptural Illustrations of Unitarianism.* By JOHN WILSON. Third edition, revised and enlarged. London: 1846.
2. *The Concessions of Trinitarians, from the works of the most eminent Biblical critics and commentators, from the era of the Reformation till the present time.* By JOHN WILSON. London and Manchester: 1856.

FAIR and kindly discussion, throwing light and warmth about the subject of dispute, has, from the days of *Æsop* down to the present, had far greater success in removing any cloak of prejudice, within which human intellect is enwrapped, than all the windy denunciations of a fierce, but puerile dogmatism. Nowhere has such dogmatism so fully displayed itself as in discussions of religious opinions; nowhere has it laid such abundant claim to the lasting deprecations of mankind. Furious in its conscious\* imbecility, it has ever sought to sustain itself by appealing to other arms than those of logic and common sense. Through it the doctrines of the Prince of Peace have been baptized in blood, and his own melancholy prediction has been fulfilled that, in the ignorance of bigotry and prejudice, men will think they do God service in the slaughter of his true disciples.

In view of these facts, so indicative of "what is in man," it behooves one entering upon religious controversy, to do so in earnest aspiration for the truth, and in charitable recognition of honest differences in human opinion. In the

---

\* *Conscious*, we mean, of its inability to defend its tenets in fair discussion, but *not* of any inherent weakness in their foundations; for well has Neander said: "When a man entrenches himself in some particular dogmatic interest, and makes that his central position, he can easily explain (viz. *for himself*) everything in conformity with his own views, and *finds everywhere a reflection of himself*." *Hist. Christ. Relig. and Church*; Vol. I., Sect. 4; Forrey Jr., p. 581.

discussion before us especially, this recognition should, on our part, be prominent, for we find frequent passages in Scripture, founded upon by some as establishing the Trinitarian doctrine, believed by others, not less convinced of its truth, to furnish no evidence in its favor. The argument from such "Concessions," however, has little other application. It can avail nothing against the doctrine itself, nor against the evidences for it in the passages of Revelation upon which it is founded, save so far as the authority of any one, who doubts the favorable interpretation, may extend as a reliable commentator. Even this use of Trinitarian "Concessions" is fully rebutted by the proof they afford of the multifarious testimony to a doctrine, which left without important support in many individual cases, can yet find other evidences sufficient to assure its adoption. Instead, therefore, of an exhibition of its inherent weakness, we must regard them as a confirmation of its fundamental strength.

The first volume cited above, however, contains a direct argument *for* Unitarianism and *against* the doctrine of the Trinity. The proof of this doctrine, we should notice, is *accumulative*. It is to be gleaned from an examination of the whole field of Scripture. In our own belief there are a few passages, which alone indisputably indicate and assert this doctrine; but all are impeached, and hence arises the necessity of accumulated proof. Justice cannot be done the Trinitarian cause unless there is had a proper appreciation of the nature of such proof—of the aid mutually rendered by one evidence to every other and by these to it. For what Bacon says of the sciences, is eminently true, also, of religious doctrine, that "its harmony, that is, when each part supports the other, is and ought to be the true and brief way of confutation and suppression of all the smaller sorts of objections; but on the other hand, if you draw out every axiom, like the sticks of a fagot, one by one, you may easily quarrel with them, and bend and break them at your pleasure."\* And we may add the words of Cardinal Wiseman,

---

\* *D. Augm. Scient.* 1. vii.

uttered in the same connection : “the successive and partial attention which we are obliged to give to separate evidences or proofs, doth greatly weaken their collective force.”\* Our opponents, of course, may justly advance similar claims to whatever advantage may result from a like consideration of the evidences adduced to sustain their positions. Nevertheless, greater disadvantage must accrue, popularly, on this ground to the Trinitarian view, since the doctrine of the Trinity is of such character, as we shall presently more fully display, as to preclude that clearness of revelation which seems demanded by reason, and which is, therefore, at *every step* and with apparent effectiveness, insisted on by Unitarians. Thus is produced a singular effect of isolation on the various proofs which are brought forward from Scripture.

If there exists such a union of persons in the Godhead, as the doctrine of the Trinity sets forth, it is plain, we think, that the apprehension of their mutual relations and the nature of their union would lie beyond the reach of human understanding. Is it strange, then, that this doctrine is delivered to us by no explicit attempt at a revelation which we should not be able to comprehend? It pervades the whole Bible in such manner as to convey to us sufficient knowledge for essential purposes—but not sufficient to confound our reason, which would seem to be the inevitable consequence upon any effort fully to satisfy it. There are things in the universe which the reason of man cannot grapple with successfully. So, as Bishop Butler has so admirably shown, it is beforehand to be expected that there should be insoluble mysteries in religion.† “Although this mystery is incomprehensible to mortals,” well says Benedict Pictet, “it must not be rejected by us: for it is not strange that finite beings such as we are, should not perfectly comprehend the nature of an infinite Being.”‡

The Unitarian doctrine originated, doubtless, in that am-

\* *Lectures on Connection between Science and Revealed Religion.* Vol. 1, lect. 1.

† See especially *Analogy of Religion*, Part II, ch. iv.

‡ *Christian Theology*: Reyroux Tr., ch. ix, sub. fin.

bitious desire of the human intellect to scale the grandest heights and sound the profoundest depths in God's moral universe.\* We contend, however, that the *dicta* of human reason—unillumined and circumscribed as it is—should not be accepted before those of a revelation, dark it is true, yet as bright as reason can receive. In this we advance nothing against the sovereignty of human reason over human opinion. We desire only to establish this principle, that, when we are convinced that a revelation, which is truly the word of God, has been given us, it does not behoove us to cast away or attempt to explain fully any portion of that revelation marked with difficulties, relating to that which is infinite and which, therefore, must in many of its relations lie beyond the sphere of a finite understanding. Starting with foregone conclusions, there is a tendency in the mind of Unitarians to accept any method of interpretation, however forced, or any explanation, however irrelevant, by which the passages of Scripture, that are exhibited as upholding the doctrine of the Trinity, may be reconciled to these conclusions. This tendency is evidenced in the volume before us, both directly and indirectly by the non-recognition of accumulative proof—the author treating each passage as if it were the sole foundation for the doctrine he opposes, and tacitly assuming that the *possibility* of explaining it in accordance with his views weakens the support which it lends to that doctrine in so material a degree as to cast out its testimony altogether.

As Jesus Christ, if solely a man, could offer no atonement for sin, Unitarianism must inevitably, when logically carried out and believed as it is by the majority of its adherents, found upon works all hope of Divine acceptance and salvation. Faith is rendered subordinate, shorn of all its sustaining and effective power, and virtually eliminated. Proof

---

\* "They" (the *Artemonites*, a branch of the ancient Monarchians or Unitarians at Rome) "were for a Christianity of the *understanding*, without any mystical element. Everything of a transcendent character, everything which would not adapt itself to their dialectic categories, was to be expurgated from their system of faith." Neander, *History of Christian Relig. and Church*, loc. cit.

of this, if any is needed for a fact promptly acknowledged by most Unitarians, we hope hereafter abundantly to offer. We notice the fact here merely for the purpose of introducing two remarks. The first is, that Unitarianism must always be, as a practical belief, cold and lifeless—*dead* for any effective development of spiritual life. No living, progressive religious energy can co-exist with morality of a merely human origin. No intense fire, of a heavenly kind, at least can glow beneath the smouldering ashes of an earthly lighted hope. Infinite expansion can be no attribute of human merit, and this cannot, therefore, fill up the fathomless abysses of human guilt, and build a mountain-pile of a good Pelion on a meritorious Ossa, that shall measure up to heaven. The half of so gigantic a work is avoided, it is true, by a denial of the inherent depravity of man, and in this Unitarianism finds what refuge there may be, but at the expense of opposition to plain Scriptural teachings, and to the deep and honest convictions of the universal heart of man.

The second remark is, that Unitarianism must ever be an unsatisfactory theology to all its calmly thinking followers. No man of this sort can avoid feeling that his own merit must at best be a poor plea for acceptance even with a most merciful God. From this uneasiness, which gives advantageous opportunity for *the truth he does believe* to speak of better things, arise longings for a more firmly founded hope,—a looking out from his peculiar doctrines for other supports,—an expectation of help from sources foreign to his theology. The day may not be distant when this desire to lay hold upon a better faith shall become more universal in the sect.\*

But to come at once into the main arena of the contest between Unitarianism and what we believe to be orthodoxy, we shall begin an investigation of some passages of Holy

---

\* Confession of the truth of what is here charged upon his theology is made by a late Unitarian writer—Rev. Mr. Ellis, of Charlestown, Mass.,—whose book, “A Half Century of Unitarianism,” has suggested the above remarks.

Writ, which assert the deity of Jesus Christ. This being established, we shall see how much emphasis of testimony is thus laid upon those clauses which indicate the claims to Godhead of the third person of the Holy Trinity.

First, then, in the very opening of John's gospel, we have the clearest assertion of the deity of Christ: "In the beginning was the Word, (or, *Logos*,) and the Word was with God, and *the Word was God*. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. . . . . And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth" (i: 1—15). It has never been questioned that these words constitute a very exact rendering of the original, though others have been offered, whilst the original is confessed to be the unaltered enunciation of the inspired apostle. We may well be allowed to ask whether, in the plain meaning they convey to an unprejudiced mind, any words could be chosen which would better express the Trinitarian doctrine of the deity of Christ, and his connection with the Father? Bishop Blomfield well remarks that "so direct and irrefragable is this testimony to the divine nature of Jesus Christ, that the Unitarians are driven to the most unreasonable methods of interpretation."\* These methods are various. That which our author seems to favor, is to the effect, that the apostle John intends by the *Logos* "to signify an attribute of the Deity, as manifested in the creation of the universe, and embodied in the character and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth." This view, he says, finds support in the fact that some sects of that day, (the Gnostics,) thought the *Logos* "to be a being altogether distinct from God," as this renders it probable that John intended to correct this notion, "by declaring the *Logos* to be nothing else than God himself." (Illustr., p. 150.) This exposition is so well set forth by the Rev. James Martineau, that we cannot refrain from quoting his words:

"St. John," he says, ". . . . . carefully warns us against thinking of his personification as otherwise than identical with the Supreme, by saying outright that the *Logos* is God; and therefore that whatever he may say about the

\* *Lects. on Acts of Apost. and Gosp. of John*: p. 256; London.

former, is really to be understood as spoken of the latter. . . . Having warned us . . . that this energy is not really a person distinct from the Supreme, he abandons himself without reserve to the beautiful personification which follows; assuring us that thereby were all things made at first, and thereby were all men being enlightened now. . . . To the end of the thirteenth verse, there is no mention of Jesus Christ as an individual; there is only the unembodied personification of the abstract energy of God in the original design, and the newer regeneration of the world. In the next verse, however, the heavenly personification is dropped upon the man Jesus; the mystic divine light is permitted to sink into the depths of his humanity; it vanishes from separate sight; and there comes before us and henceforth lives within our view throughout the Gospel, the Man of sorrows, the Child of God, with the tears and infirmities of our mortal nature and the moral perfection of the Divine. 'And the Word was made flesh.' . . .<sup>2\*</sup>

Here, we take it, is an eloquent contradiction of one Unitarian doctrine made in order to sustain another. John tells us that the Logos is God, and it follows that "*whatever he may say about the former, is really to be understood as spoken of the latter.*" This exposition will answer quite well as long as the apostle is speaking of the creation, as the work of the Logos; but when he says "the Logos was made (or, *became*) flesh and dwelt among us," he must mean, if we interpret his words consistently, that God became man. But this is a doctrine the very negative, indeed, of a fundamental tenet of Unitarianism, and one which the Rev. G. W. Burnap, a Unitarian divine, pronounces "totally shocking." Yet it is upon this horn of the dilemma that Martineau, Wilson and others, elect to transfix themselves, in order to escape the other conclusion, that John speaks of a personal Logos, who is God. Andrews Norton, it is true, in his "Statement of Reasons," (pp. 241-245,) attempts to explain away these difficulties, but with little success. Abauzit and others had before made equally futile efforts to avoid the consequences of the assumption.

Justly dissatisfied with this exposition, that able advocate of Unitarianism, Dr. Lant Carpenter, among others, adopts an interpretation, which renders the words θεός ην ὁ λόγος, "the Word was *a god.*" This translation will appear sufficiently forced on consideration of the context. Those adopting this interpretation do not deny that θεός, *God*, in the clause immediately preceding that just mentioned, means the Supreme

---

\* *The Proposition that "Christ is God" False, a Lecture*; pp. 34, 35, apud Wilson.

Deity. They would have us believe that John uses this word in two utterly incompatible senses, within two consecutive clauses of a brief sentence. Certain it is, that had John intended to affirm that "the Word was God," he would have used the very expression we here find. Is it probable, then, that he would have used these words, if the Word were *not* God? Would he not rather, if such were the case, have written the negative of this proposition, lest he might give foundation to the conjecture of some sort of intimate connection between the Logos and God, by what he had just affirmed of the former being *with* God? Dr. Carpenter's interpretation we cannot but think equivalent to an accusation against the apostle, either of egregious trifling or of criminal ambiguity. At a time when a Polytheism prevailed, which was little else than a deification of men, it would ill become an inspired writer to afford such ground for a belief in the godhead of one, who is, according to the Unitarians, merely a human being, as is here derivable from the plainest interpretation of his words.

In vain, then, we think, have been the attempts to defend any other than the common and obvious acceptation of this clause. There is, moreover, sufficient in the passage itself to show that John meant by *the Logos*, Jesus Christ; but to remove any doubt, we cite that passage from the book of Revelation, by the same writer, in which we are told that the *name* of Jesus "is called *the Word of God*," (xix: 13.) Hence the meaning conveyed by the words of the apostle is, that "in the beginning Christ existed, and Christ was with God, and Christ was God." Here is directly asserted the deity of Christ; and whatever interpretation may be put upon the words "in the beginning," the eternal existence of Christ is established in the fact of his divinity, and he is, indeed, the "*eternal Word*," as Ignatius calls him, and that "*eternal life*," as John himself says, "which was *with the Father, and was manifested unto us.*" (1 John i: 2.)

The passage we shall next notice is found in the same Gospel. The Jews came to Jesus and asked him to tell them plainly if he were the Christ. He answered that he had already

told them—that his works confirmed his words—but they believed not, because they were not of his “sheep;” that these hear his voice, and he gives “unto them eternal life,” and “none shall pluck them out of his hand;” that his Father gave them to him, who is greater than all enemies, so that “none is able to pluck them out of his Father’s hand,” concluding with the assertion: “I and the Father are one.”\* (x: 24-30.) This expression *may*, of course, only mean that the Father and the Son are *at one*,† in the purpose of protecting true believers from the assaults of all their enemies. But it may mean, also, something more general and inclusive of this, namely, that the Father and the Son are identical in nature and hence in purpose. “None shall pluck them out of my hand,” he may mean, “for, as you Jews will admit, none *can* pluck them out of the hand of my Almighty Father, and I and he are one in nature, have the same infinite power and the same gracious purposes.” In this sense the Jews around him understood his words, for on taking up stones to stone Jesus, they tell him it is for blasphemy that they wish to punish him, “and because,” say they, “that thou, being a man, *makest thyself God.*” What answer does Jesus make to them? Does he tell them that they have misunderstood him? Does he deny that he is “one” with the Father in the sense which they have taken? He does nothing of the kind; but immediately enters upon a defence of himself, without retracting or implying a retraction of an enunciation which to them had the appearance of blasphemy, as asserting an equality on his part with God the Father. He shows that were he to assume the title of God he would not necessarily be guilty of blasphemy, inasmuch as *men*, “unto whom the word of God came,” were called *gods* in the Scripture, and therefore it could not be blasphemous in “him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world,” to say “I am the *Son of God.*” Having thus cleared himself from the accusation,

---

\* Thus in the Greek, the common version has “*my Father*,” but the pronoun is unauthorized.

† As elsewhere: ch. xvii: 11, 21, 22, 23; of which presently.

as far as it might be grounded on his calling God his Father, which once before (v: 17, 18) they had taken as equivalent to an assertion of his equality with God, he proceeds to defend the affirmation that he is one with the Father. "If I do not the works of my Father," he says, "believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe me not, believe the works: *that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in the Father.*" Is not this a plain re-affirmation of his union and oneness with the Father? Certainly the Jews so understood it, and the apostle who records the event, shows that he thinks such a conclusion from the words of Christ natural and logical, by adding "*therefore* they sought again to take him." Does not he, who explains his words in any other way, charge Christ with wilfully deceiving his auditors?

It may be said that in another chapter of the same Gospel, (xvii: 11, 21-23,) Christ, in prayer to the Father, uses this union existing between them, as an illustration of that which he desires for his disciples among themselves, comparing one with the other as if of the same nature. "Holy Father," is his prayer, "keep through thine own name those whom\* thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are." Again, he prays for his disciples in all time that "they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be [one] in us. . . . And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one . . . ." The particle of comparison here translated *as*, and *even as*, is in the original *καὶ ως*, which is admitted by Unitarians† not to mean generally *equality in degree*, but merely *likeness*. Such is undoubtedly its meaning in many passages; as in

\* This should read: "thine own name, *which* thou hast given me;" according to the majority of authoritative MSS., and to Griesbach.

† See Mr. Wilson and Dr. Carpenter on John, v: 23; "that all men should honor the Son *even as* they honor the Father." (Illustr. p. 298.) Here it is to the advantage of their argument, if such a meaning can be established for the word.

chapter xiv: 27, of the Gospel before us—"not as the world giveth, give I unto you;" and in Luke vi: 36—"be ye therefore merciful as your Father also is merciful;" and in 1 John ii: 6, and iii: 3, 7—"every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, *even as* he (Christ) is pure," and "he that doeth righteousness is righteous, *even as* he is righteous." Hence, Christ may, in the clauses cited above, refer to an essential union between himself and the Father, without by the comparison affirming the possibility of an equally essential union among his disciples.

In the twentieth chapter of the same Gospel, Christ is explicitly called God by one of his disciples. Thomas, having been absent from an assembly of the disciples, at which Christ appeared, told them he would not believe in his resurrection without the most convincing proof, such as seeing and touching the print of the nails in his hands, and the spear-wound in his side. At his next appearance, Thomas was with the rest of the disciples, and Jesus said to him: "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing." "Thomas answered and said unto him, *My Lord and my God.*" Some Unitarians explain these words as a mere exclamation, either as meaning nothing more than an expression of surprise, or as an invocation of God without reference to Christ, or as addressed partly to Christ and partly to God. The last interpretation is in itself sufficiently improbable, and we think, indeed, it is impossible properly to appreciate the context and adhere to either of these expositions. Thomas is said to have "*answered and said unto him*" the words in question, and this must be allowed a strange introduction of an exclamation of surprise. As Thomas, moreover, addressed his words to Christ, they cannot certainly, whether constituting an invocation or an affirmation, apply *in whole or in part* to any one else. Moreover, the form of the original favors the view that the clause is to be taken as containing an affirmation:—"Thou art my Lord and my God."

Other Unitarians admit that the words are addressed

solely to Jesus, both titles being applied to him, but assert that the word *God* is not employed as meaning the Supreme Deity, but only “to indicate the fullest conviction of Thomas, that Christ was his divine Teacher,” his words being “My lord and my god!” The original at once stamps this assumption as wholly gratuitous. ‘Ο Θεος μου can only mean “my God,” and no possible rule of interpretation can be pleaded in defence of any other rendition. The objection that Thomas, as a Jew, could not bring himself to render to one, whom shortly before he had considered as a mere man, and even as an “inanimate clod,” the title of Supreme God, is plausible enough. We should consider, however, that Thomas was not only a Jew, but *a man*, and that he, in a moment when all his disbelief is made to vanish by the most indisputable evidence of the resurrection of his Lord,—an act predicating divine power of the highest type,—may have uttered what, in a more deliberate frame, he might have been more tardy in expressing. Convinced by this single proof of Christ’s omnipotence and divinity, of which as a disciple he must have had some suggestion previously, he accepts him as his God:—δ Θεος μου—*my God, my only God*. But in his precipitancy he may have erred. Granted that he may. We will not, therefore, receive his words, unsustained by other proof, as testimony to Christ’s divinity. But we receive the testimony of Jesus himself, who so far from rebuking Thomas for the arrant idolatry, which on a Unitarian view must lie in his words,—the idolatry of making a mere man “*his God*,”—approves of his belief as embodied in this *confession of faith*: “Jesus saith unto him, ‘Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed.’”

We shall next examine a passage from Paul’s epistle to the Romans, (ix: 4, 5.) In the common version it is as follows:—“Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption. . . . : whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.” The last clause is, in the Greek, according to the received text, which has the endorsement of Griesbach: εξ ὧν δ Χριστός το ζατα σαρκα, δ ων επι πανταν Θεος εν-

*λογητος εις τους αιωνας*; literally rendered: “From whom” is Christ according to the flesh, who is over all God blessed for ever.” By a different punctuation from that exhibited above, namely, by placing a *period* after *σαρξα*, many Unitarians\* translate the clause to the following effect: “Of whom Christ came, according to the flesh:—God, who is over all, be blessed for ever. Amen.” The apostle is thus made to close the enumeration of the spiritual advantages and honors of the Israelites, by an abrupt though, it may be, sufficiently natural, ascription of blessing to God. The argument by which this interpretation is sustained, is founded partly on the attributive attached to *God*, as “over all,” which is said never to be so applied in the sacred writings to Christ; partly on the expression, “blessed for ever,” which is also said never to be applied. In fact, the verbal adjective *ευλογητος*, *blessed*, is not found elsewhere in the New Testament predicated of Christ; but the participle *ευλογημενος*, which is perfectly exchangeable with it,† is found applicable not only to Christ, but also to the Virgin Mary.‡ There are, besides, various passages, in which ascriptions of *glory*, *praise* and *dominion* “forever” are made to Jesus Christ, in the New Testament. § Still further; in *Revelations*, v: 13, we read: “And every creature . . . .

\* Many, on the other hand, prefer to place the period after *παντων*, and as it seems solely a matter of taste, we ourselves should adopt this method, as it renders a doxological version rather more consistent with established rules of the language, than in the other case. This rendition, however, as it attributes the designation “over all” to Christ, overthrows one of the two arguments, which are advanced in favor of the other interpretation.

† In *signification*, we mean; which is shown in several passages of the Septuagint. Compare Psalm cxiii: 2 with Psalm lxxii: 19; but see, especially, 1 Sam. xxv: 33,—“blessed (*ευλογητος*) be thy advice, and blessed (*ευλογημενη*) be thou.” That *ευλογητος*, moreover, is used in ascriptions of blessing other than those to God the Father, is shown in the passage just quoted, as also in Genesis xxiv: 31; xxvi: 29, and in Psalm lxxii: 19, LXX.

‡ See Matthew, xxi: 9; xxiii: 39; Mark, xi: 9, 10; Luke, i: 28; xiii: 35; xix: 38; and John, xii: 13.

§ See 2 Timothy, iv: 18; Hebrews, xiii: 20, 21; 1 Peter, iv: 11; 2 Peter, iii: 18; *Revelations*, i: 5, 6.

heard I saying, *Blessing* (*εὐλογία*), and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and *unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. Amen.*" How idle, then, is any argument founded upon the supposed restriction of the phrase "blessed for ever" from any application to Jesus Christ! As to the expression, "over all," a denial of its applicability to Christ is rendered futile by a clause in the very next chapter of the epistle before us (x: 12), where he is called "Lord over all" (*Κυριος παντων*, Lord of all); so, also, in Acts, x: 36; and in John. iii: 31, he is said to be "above (or, over) all" (*επανω παντων*).

The position of the word *εὐλογητος*, moreover, favors the common version, as "we find five instances of doxology in the New Testament, and about forty in the Old, in which it is uniformly placed first."\* The single exception, in the whole Bible, to this order occurs in Psalm lxviii: 19; and this, in fact, is doubtful.

Again, we think the specification of Christ's connection with the Israelites as being *κατα σαρκα*, *according to the flesh*, countenances the application to him of the opposing phrase, *δι επι παντων Θεος*, *God over all*, as indicating his *divine nature*. This opinion we advance, notwithstanding the assertion of Mr. Wilson, that "from St. Paul's application of the same expression to himself and others, it is evident that the argument is altogether futile" (Illustr., p. 164). Let us examine the passages to which he refers. In the third verse of the chapter before us (chapter ix), Paul says: "I could wish myself accursed from Christ, for my brethren,—*my kinsmen according to the flesh.*" It is plain that the words, "my kinsmen according to the flesh," were added here by the apostle in order to make clear the reference in the expression, "my brethren;"—to show that he, in this place, spoke not of the whole body of Roman disciples, whom he had before more than once (i: 13; vii: 1; viii: 12;) addressed as "brethren," that is, "brethren in Christ" (Colossians i: 2), but of his "brethren in the flesh," his kinsmen by blood. We shall find that this

\* Professor Stuart: Answer to Channing, Letter iii.

expression, “according to the flesh,” is always used, as here, antithetically. Thus, when, in 1 Corinthians, x: 18, Paul speaks of “*Israel after the flesh*,” it is in plainly implied opposition to the “*Israel of God*” (Galatians, vi: 16). In Romans, iv: 1, the distinction is between “*Abraham, our father as pertaining to the flesh*,” and God, “*our Father in heaven*;”—in Galatians iv: 23, between the “*child born after the flesh*,” and the “*child by promise*” of God, or, as he afterwards expresses it, “*the child born after the Spirit*” (verse 29). In Ephesians, vi: 5, and in Colossians, iii: 22, the distinction is between “*masters according to the flesh*,” and the spiritual Master and Lord of all, Jesus Christ. It follows, therefore, that in the passage before us, Paul intends to mark a two-fold character in the nature of Christ, distinguishing one element as of human origin from another, which must, therefore be divine. As an opposing clause follows that in which His fleshly descent is stated, it is natural and logical to conclude that therein is asserted His spiritual or divine character. Thus, then, the antithesis will appear, that as “*after the flesh*” Christ was an Israelite, so “*after the Spirit*” He is “*God over all, blessed for ever.*”

We cannot refrain from briefly noticing another argument, which, proceeding upon the admitted faithfulness of the common English version of this passage, can, of course, lend no support to those we have already examined, but is intended as a reserve defence in case of their utter overthrow. And we should notice that whatever validity the argument has, it is as much opposed to the other interpretations defended by Unitarians, as it is to that we have maintained. If it is true, the others *must* be false; it may, therefore, constitute a reserve, but it is a hostile reserve. Whatever probability may attach to it, so much is removed from the other Unitarian expositions. Dr. Channing is its author, and he begins by calling attention to the fact that Christ is first asserted to be a natural descendant of the Israelites, which circumstance he thinks as inconsistent with Supreme divinity as is possible. “Now,” he continues, “could any persons acquainted with Paul, with his belief

of God's unity, eternity and invisibleness,—on reading this passage, have imagined, that the apostle intended to declare Jesus, whom he calls a Jew by birth, to be Supreme God, infinite, eternal, unbegotten and invisible? How natural and necessary is it to restrain and modify the last clause by the first! Jesus, we know, was exalted by God to be head over all things to the Church, to be Lord of Jews and Gentiles, of the living and the dead, that is, of all mankind. We also know, that the title *God* was frequently applied to persons possessing extensive power and dominion. How much more natural is it, then, to suppose that Paul intended to express Christ's exaltation to universal empire by calling him 'God over all,' than to suppose that he meant to ascribe proper and supreme divinity to a descendant of the Israelites! [!] These arguments show that the passage does not support Trinitarianism, even if translated rightly in our English Bible; of which, however, I am by no means satisfied."\*

The author's own opinion of the value of this argument is curiously exhibited in the fact, that though it depends for its whole force and truth on the translation of the passage in question, as given in the common version, he yet hesitates not to affirm his belief in the unfaithfulness of that translation. It is observable, also, that just such arguments as this could be advanced against every direct affirmation of Christ's divinity, how many soever the sacred writers may have seen fit to make. Such an argument is, therefore, simply equivalent to the assumption that those writers *could not* have "meant to ascribe proper and supreme divinity" to Christ. The particular assumptions in the extract before us should be noticed. It is assumed, here, that Paul believed in such a unity of the Godhead as to preclude a trinity of persons. It is assumed that he could not call Jesus *God* in the highest sense without ascribing "proper and supreme divinity" to his humanity. It is assumed that the union of a Divine nature with the human nature of Christ, (especially, it seems, as he was a Jew!) is impossible, because, for-

\* Note in Sermon on the Doctrines of Christianity.

sooth that Divine nature must be eternal, infinite and invisible. In fact, as we have said, the whole question at issue is assumed in this boasted argument.

There is a passage in the epistle of Jude which should be examined here, as we believe it to assert that Christ is "only Sovereign," which he must be as "God over all." In the fourth verse of that epistle, the following clause is found: "denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ," in the original *τὸν μονὸν δεσπότην Θεον καὶ Κυριον ἡμῶν Ἰησον Χριστὸν αρνούμενον*. The word *Θεον*, *God*, is probably spurious, being "omitted in A (the Alexandrian MS.), B (the Vatican), C (the Ephrem), sixteen others with Erpen's Arabic, the Coptic, *Æthiopic*, Armenian and Vulgate, and by many of the fathers."\* Griesbach rejects it as unauthentic. We think, therefore, the text is undoubtedly to be read (as Unitarians admit): "denying the only Sovereign and our Lord Jesus Christ." Of course, by Unitarians, "Sovereign" is held to refer to the Father on the ground that, as Carpenter says, this word "is in no clear instance applied to Jesus." If it can be shown, then, that out of the four other instances similar to the above,† in which it occurs in the New Testament, two have reference to Christ—there will be strong ground for the inference that in the passage before us it is applied to Him, as the Greek construction is admitted somewhat to favor that interpretation. The two instances to which we refer are found in 2 Peter, ii: 1, and Rev. vi. 10. The epistle of Jude is, for the most part, a copy of the 2nd chapter of the second epistle of Peter.‡ Jude thinks it "needful to write" because "there are certain men *crept in unawares, ungodly men*, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Sovereign and our Lord Jesus Christ." Peter writes that "there shall be *false teachers*, who *privily shall bring in damnable heresies*, even

\* Dr. Adam Clarke, in loc.

† We, of course, exclude from this account all cases in which it is used of men.

‡ Jude writes, apparently, only to apply to the actual fact what Peter had predicted.

denying the Lord ( $\delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\sigma\tau\eta\pi$ ) that bought them." Evidently, we think, Jude means by  $\delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ , just whatever Peter meant. Now, by the "Lord that bought them," can be meant no other than he "who gave himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. ii: 6); who "gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people" (Titus ii: 14);—who "hath redeemed (*bought*) us from the curse of the law" (Gal. iii: 13), "redeemed (*bought*) us to God by his blood" (Rev. v: 9). Hence  $\delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$  must be here applied to Christ, as it must, also, in the passage from Jude, since he, as the copyist of Peter, undoubtedly intended to indicate by this word the same person, as did Peter—our Redeemer and Lord, Jesus Christ.

The other passage, which we have cited as containing an application of the same word to Christ, occurs in the 6th chapter of the Revelation of John, where we find a description of the opening of the seals by Christ, the Lamb of God, and in the 9th and 10th verses of which we read: "When he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God and for the testimony which they held; and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord ( $\Delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\tau\eta\varsigma$ ), holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" There are several reasons for believing that Christ is here invoked. Whatever may be meant by the opening of the seals, it is certain that the opening of each is followed, as an occasioning cause at least, by its appropriate effect. Christ is the agent who opens the seals, and naturally to him would be addressed any prayer of complaint as to the apparent tardiness displayed in the work and in the development of purposes of God depending on it. *He* would, also, naturally be called upon to "judge and avenge" the "souls of them that were slain," as He shall "judge the quick and the dead" (2 Tim. iv: 1). Yet he will not do this until "his appearing," and hence these souls are told to "rest for a [little] season," (ver. 11), until the purposes of God should be fulfilled. And "a season" afterward, the sixth seal is opened (ver. 12), and the end is, and the terrors of

the last day come upon the earth, and the oppressors of His people are stricken with fear and amazement, “for the great day of the *wrath of the Lamb*” is come. Here, then, as naturally we expect a prayer of this kind to be offered to the Lamb, so we find that it is answered by the Lamb, and that it is He who “judges and *avenges*” His people in the “day of His wrath.” Furthermore, the expression “holy and true,” as an attribute to the  $\delta\varepsilon\sigma\pi\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$ , favors the interpretation we have maintained, since we find the same combination of titles applied to Christ by himself, in chapter iii : 7, and in two other places he is called “faithful and true,” which is a similar combination.

The great mass of probability, then, lies with that exposition of the passage in Jude which refers both  $\delta\varepsilon\sigma\pi\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$  and  $\alpha\nu\rho\iota\sigma\tau$  to Christ ; and the translation of the clause should be as follows: “denying the only Sovereign, even our Lord, Jesus Christ ;” asserting the deity of Christ in unmistakable terms, who, as *one* with the Father and the Holy Ghost, is “*only* Sovereign.”

In Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians, there is a passage which has been much discussed and which should have some notice at our hands. The whole clause in which it occurs, is as follows: “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself . . . .” (ii: 5-8). What the “form of God” may signify, we care not to discuss; it may refer, as Unitarians insist, simply to “external appearance,” yet this sense will in nothing detract from the weight of testimony here given for the deity of Christ. For if it means merely outward form, we must render to the similar words, which follow, a similar acceptation, and believe that when Christ Jesus “became flesh” he assumed an exterior appearance the same as that possessed by slaves, and yet was only a man in “likeness,” in “fashion,” in out-

ward semblance,\* and therefore must have been something different from man in his essential nature, which is contrary to Unitarian belief. And, on the other hand, we know and Unitarians contend, that Christ was "very man," and it, therefore, follows that this statement as to his being in "fashion as a man," is not intended to exclude belief in his being really a man, and is not set over in opposition to the fact of his proper humanity. On the contrary, this observation certainly favors, if it does not necessitate, the view that by implication these expressions also affirm the reality of his essential manhood. Whence it would follow that the expression, "form of God," is not in opposition to the possibility of Christ's being in essence God, but rather implies that he is so. With these remarks we pass on to examine the more important and more warmly contested clause: "thought it not robbery to be equal with God," which in the original is: *οὐχ ἀρπαγμον ἵγησατο το εἰναι ισα Θεῷ*. The last four words of this are literally translated "*the being equal with God*," or, taken in the connection, "*his being equal with God*;" in other words *his equality with God*. The verbal *ἀρπαγμον* has given difficulty, though the translation of it above, viz: *robbery*, is generally agreed to as strictly grammatical. Yet we think a clearer and more probable meaning is deducible from the verb *ἀρπαζειν*, from which the verbal is derived. The primary sense of the verb is to "snatch, or seize away," to which is logically superadded the idea of "eager desire;" whence naturally follows the sense of "holding with eager or earnest desire." Taking this sense we may translate the clause above: "counted his equality with God not a thing to be eagerly held." This, we think, is the true sense of the clause, and best accords with the context. The apostle is exhorting the Philippians to the practice of humility, and appealing to the example of Christ, desires them to have "the mind" which was in him "who, though being in the form of God, thought his equality with

---

\* This lands us, of course, at once in Docetism.

God not a thing to be eagerly held, but emptied himself\* and took the form of a slave, and was born in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself . . . .” Here was a grand example of humility, of one equal with God laying aside all his “mastery and glories,” and humbling himself in the form and likeness of man.

To avoid controversy, however, on minute points of interpretation, let us accept a rendering which will not be questioned, with reference to the point just noticed, by most of our opponents—that of the common version. Some Unitarians, however, object to the interpretation given to the adverbial particle *ισα*, of *equal*, and attempt to establish the sense of mere *likeness* or *resemblance*, and translate the clause containing it “*to be like or as God*.” How this interpretation is sustained we know not; certain it is, that in all cases in the New Testament, within our present knowledge, where the adjective *ισος*, or any of its compounds, is used the reference is invariably to equality and never to mere resemblance.\* Now, if Christ “thought it not robbery to be equal with God,” or to be esteemed so, it follows necessarily that he was so; for, if a mere man, this would have been on his part more than an act of robbery—it would have been the most tremendous impiety. How could Paul, in adducing the humility of Christ as an example, bring forward such an instance of unparalleled presumption to point the precept, and to emphasize the fact of his humility at the expense of his godliness! The apostle would, if such were the true exposition of his words, practically contradict himself. Mr. Wilson’s interpretation of the passage is curious. He says: “He (Paul) places before their eyes the example

\* *Emptied himself* is the literal meaning of *ἐαντον εξενωσε*, rendered in the common version “made himself of no reputation.” “Emptied himself,” asks Bishop Sherlock, “of what? Not of his Being or Nature, but of the Glories and Majesty belonging to him.” *Discourses*, Dis. 1, Part iii; Vol. iv., p. 42, London, 1758.

\* As in Matth. xx: 12; Luke vi: 34; xx: 36; John v: 18; 2 Cor. viii: 14; Phil. ii: 20; 2 Pet. i: 1; Rev. xxi: 16. In Mark xiv: 56, 59, it actually acquires the sense of *sameness*, or *substantial consistency*.

of their Lord and Master, who, so far from ‘ arrogating to himself equality with God,’ preferred being subject to the greatest ills of which human nature is susceptible, rather than appear with that *splendor or dignity which he might justly have assumed*, rather than employ, for his own ease and emolument, those extraordinary powers which he had received from the Father.” What a just assumption!—one which would have overthrown the whole central force and idea of his earthly ministry, and subverted the very purpose for which, as a man and as a messenger of God, he was endowed with superhuman attributes.

“ It is highly improbable,” continues Mr. Wilson, “ that he should have recommended to the members of the Philip-pian church to ‘ esteem others better than themselves’; and at the same time exhibit, as an incentive to such praiseworthy conduct, the example of one who, instead of being ‘ meek and lowly in heart,’—instead of relinquishing his own comforts in order to minister to the wants of others, esteemed himself infinitely above his brethren, by putting himself on a perfect equality with the greatest and best of beings” (Illustr., p. 291). Now here, we take it, is a rare fallacy. Mr. Wilson has raised a fog, and amid the murkiness is employed in fighting himself, or, at least, his own shadow. He unwittingly attributes to his opponents his own idea of the nature of Christ, and shows, triumphantly, that under such condition it would have been a gross absurdity to invoke, in a discourse on the virtue of humility, this instance of extravagant pride and self-estimation, as the act of a worthy exemplar. His reasonings, therefore, answer a good purpose, here, in refuting himself. So it must be, and Unitarians are thus brought to the necessity of asserting that Paul could not have intended to convey the idea that Christ did not think it a robbery to be *equal* with God, but only to be *like* God. It is evident, we think, that there are, here, two states spoken of in the history of Christ—one of exaltation, the other of voluntary humiliation.\* The clauses exhibiting

---

\* Consult Sherlock, *Discourses*, loc. cit.

these stand in opposition and are united by the contrastive conjunction *αλλα, but*. In the clause preceding *αλλα*, then, we look for specifications referring to one of these states, which we find to be the former. Of this state and its attendant glories he “emptied himself,” and assumed the form of man. In that state of exaltation, then, did Christ exist *before* he “was made (or, born) in the likeness of men.” Hence, the explanation given by Mr. Wilson, that he “did not arrogate to himself equality with God, in the splendor or dignity which he might justly have assumed,” utterly fails, in that it assumes this state of potential exaltation to have existed after Christ was born; indeed, after he was endowed as a great prophet with wonderful power from on high. Yet Paul says he “emptied himself;” not, therefore, of potential, but of actual glory, and humbled himself afterward as man. We conclude, then, that the sense we have given is the true meaning of the passage. It is briefly this: Christ, though in the form of God, did not eagerly hold his equality with God, but laid aside his majesty and glory and took upon him the humble form and likeness of man, thus furnishing an instance of profound humility.

Finally we shall notice, in the present section of our proof of the deity of Christ, a clause found in Titus ii: 13, which is as follows: “Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ (*επιφανειαν της δοξης του μεγαλου Θεου και σωτηρος ημων Ιησου Χριστου*).” According to the commonly received doctrine of the Greek article,\* its omission here before the sec-

\* We cannot but consider the following argument from the Rev. Benjamin Mardon, against this doctrine, as peculiarly infelicitous: “In the present instance,” he says “the same verse, I apprehend, contains a refutation of the doctrine in the strictness contended for. It would prove that the blessed *hope* and the *appearance* of God are identical; for I cannot consider the insertion of the adjective *blessed*, as altering the case. It is true that they both relate to the same object, and have a close connection; so are God and Christ closely connected in the work of human redemption, but this does not prove their identity.” Now the word *ελπις*, *hope*, frequently means, as also does the English word, *a thing hoped for*, the object of the emotion. This sense it has in Romans, viii: 24; in Galatians, v: 5; in Colossians, i: v; and in other places in Paul’s writings. This must be its meaning here, we think, as this *blessed* hope is “looked

ond epithet, *σωτῆρος*, *Saviour*, favors that interpretation which joins the two titles, "the great God" and "our Saviour," in a common reference to Jesus Christ. Whatever weight is due to this consideration, the interpretation it favors is confirmed, we think, by the fact that Paul speaks of an "appearing;" for nowhere do we read of the "appearing" of the Father, the invisible God, whom "no man hath seen at any time," whom no "man shall see and live" (John, i: 18; Exodus, xxxiii: 20); but solely of the appearing" of Jesus Christ. To escape the force of this argument, Unitarians have generally translated the words *επιφανεῖαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγαλού Θεοῦ*, "the appearance of the glory of the great God," explaining the interpretation very plausibly by a reference to the passage (Luke ix: 26), in which Christ speaks of his coming "in his own glory, and in his Father's and of the holy angels." This is the exposition given by Mr. Wilson; yet when he comes, a few pages further on, to speak of the title "Lord of glory," bestowed upon Christ, in 1 Corinthians, ii: 8, he remarks that "it is highly probable that the title, *Lord of glory*, is a Hebraism, and signifies *glorious Lord* or *Master*; being analogous to such expressions as *King of glory*, which denotes the glorious king; *God of truth*, the true God; *ambassador of faithfulness*, a faithful ambassador." We had not expected this inconsistency in an author, who proposes to "awaken men to a proper and manly exercise of their intellectual powers." Of his opposite positions, we are disposed to accept that last cited as substantially true; if for no other reason, because in this we find an opinion carefully elaborated, and sustained by multitudinous proofs, and not an explanation adopted under the imminent pressure of a passage, hostile to preconceived beliefs. There

---

*for.*" The "blessed hope," taken in this sense, is identical with the "glorious appearing." This being established, the probability in favor of a similar rendering of the concluding portion of the clause is augmented; and the whole may be thus expressed: "looking for that blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of the great God, even our Saviour, Jesus Christ."

are numerous instances in the Scriptures of the Hebraism spoken of above, but especially, of course, in the Old Testament. We shall set down a table of some of these, for which we are principally indebted to Mr. Wilson himself:

*A man of opportunity*—a fit man, . . . . . Lev. xvi: 21,  
*Men of death*—dead men, . . . . . 2 Sam. xix: 28,  
*Laws of truth*—true laws, . . . . . Neh. ix: 13,  
*Man of arm*—mighty man, . . . . . Job xxii: 8,  
*Waters of quietness*—still waters, . . . . . Ps. xxiii: 2,  
*Name of joy*—joyful name, . . . . . Jer. xxxiii: 9,  
*Father of mercies*—merciful Father, . . . . . 2 Cor. i: 3.

As to the New Testament and the particular expression before us, we venture to say that there is not *one* instance, in which the rendering of  $\tau\eta\varsigma\deltao\xi\eta\varsigma$ , as equivalent to the adjective *glorious*, does not convey as good a sense as is afforded when taken substantively; and in many cases a far better one, whilst in some the translation as a noun is wholly to be rejected.\* Of passages of the last kind we find instances in Romans, viii: 21, Philippians, iii: 21, Colossians, i: 11, and perhaps in 2 Corinthians, iv: 4, and 1 Timothy, i: 11,—where the “glorious liberty of the children of God,” “his glorious body,” “his glorious power,” and the “glorious gospel,” are mentioned.† Whenever Paul wishes to speak of *glory*, as such, and not as an attrib-

\* Of course, we speak here of those constructions in which  $\tau\eta\varsigma\deltao\xi\eta\varsigma$  stands unaccompanied by any restricting word. It is hardly necessary, then, to say that “*his glory*,” is properly expressed by  $\tau\eta\varsigma\deltao\xi\eta\varsigma\alpha\tau\omega\varsigma$ .

† In 1 Cor. ii: 8, “Lord of glory,” and in Eph. i: 17, “Father of glory” are better rendered “glorious Lord” and “glorious Father.” So, also, “the riches of the glory of his inheritance,” and “the riches of the glory of this mystery” (Eph. i: 18, Coloss. i: 27), are improved, we think, by the substitution of the phrase “glorious riches.” The “hope of glory,” (Coloss. i: 27, Rom. v: 2), is as well expressed by “glorious hope;” and “the light of the knowledge of the glory of God” is clearer, we think, when read, “the light of the glorious knowledge of God” (2 Cor. iv: 6). We have purposely selected passages from Paul’s writings. We may refer to similar constructions elsewhere, as in the LXX: for instance, Ps. lxxii: 19, “name of glory,” properly rendered in the English version “glorious name;” and so, in Ps. cxlv: 5, instead of “honor of the glory of thy majesty,” we read, “the glorious honor of thy majesty.”

utive, we find him using simply  $\deltaοξης$ , without the article. Thus, “the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ” (2 Thess. ii : 14) “the praise of the glory of his grace” (Eph. i : 6), “a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory” (2 Cor. iv : 17), “the cherubim of glory” (Heb. ix : 5). We are, hence, justified in concluding that in the passage before us, Paul speaks not of *glory* as substantive, but as an attributive of the “*appearing*” of Christ; and that the sense of the clause is truly rendered thus: “looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God, even our Saviour, Jesus Christ;” and whereby is directly asserted the proper Godhead of Christ, and virtually his union with the Father.

We have now examined all the passages our space will allow, which affirm the deity of Christ, by according to him the name of *God*, in its sense of the Supreme, or by asserting his unity with the Father. We have shown him to be the eternal *Logos*, which was with God, and which was God; to be *one* with the Father; to be the self-acknowledged God of Thomas; to be “*God over all*,” and, as one with the Father and the Holy Ghost, the only Sovereign Lord; to have been, previous to his incarnation, “*in the form of God*,” and equal with God, and to be, both now and then, “*the great God, our Saviour*.”

Our object, in the next place, will be to show that attributes of deity are ascribed to Christ, thus proving him to be “*very God*.” Here we shall be able to examine only two passages, occurring in the gospel of Matthew, which contain promises dear to the heart of every true believer, and which, we think, assert the omnipresence of Jesus. The first of these is found in the 18th chapter, and is as follows: “Again I say unto you, that, if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father, who is in heaven; for where two or three are gathered together in my name, *there am I in the midst of them*,” (vv. 19, 20). Without dwelling upon the intimate relation here suggested by Christ, between himself and the Father—such as to make his own audience of peti-

tions tantamount to their concession by the Father—we pass on to remark upon the arguments urged against the Trinitarian interpretation of the passage. Mr. Wilson objects to the view of its being Christ's intention to assert his omnipresence, that there is no record, no intimation of the astonishment which such an announcement would naturally have induced in his disciples; that, in fact, so far from this, Peter in the next verse coolly questions him on a totally disconnected subject: “*then* (*τότε*) came Peter to him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him?” But these objections are readily refuted by reference to the fact that from necessity the style of the evangelist is disjointed; that every circumstance connected with any event recorded cannot possibly be and, in fact, is never, detailed; but especially to the fact that the conjunction *τότε*, *then*, *at that time*, does not more frequently mean *immediately after*, than it expresses in an indefinite manner a sequence in time, as *afterwards*, *after that*, *about that time*.\* It is, therefore, not necessary to suppose that no time elapsed between the utterance of our Saviour, which is supposed to justify astonishment in his disciples, and the question which Peter asks with reference to what Christ had just before (vv. 15-17) been saying. Furthermore, admitting that there is naturally to be expected some astonishment on the part of his disciples, it does not follow that they would give expression to it, or, if they had expressed it, that the evangelist would record it. For, in the chapter preceding the one before us, we find the recital of Christ's transfiguration, which was an occurrence, one would think, calculated to excite the most profound astonishment and awe in the beholders, and, indeed, did so, as we learn from the parallel passage in Mark's Gospel; yet the simple record of that event, as given by Matthew, is as follows: “Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John, his brother, and bringeth them up into an high moun-

\* See Matth. xxvi: 3, 31, 36; iv: 1; ii: 7, 16; iii: 13; ix: 14; xi: 9,; xii: 22; xv: 1, 12; xvi: 27; xix: 13; xxii: 15; xxiii: 1; xxiv: 2—<sup>for some of the instances in which</sup> *τότε* <sup>is used in this</sup> *general* <sup>sense,</sup> by St. Matthew.

tain apart, and was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias, talking with him. *Then answered Peter and said unto Jesus, Lord it is good for us to be here.*" But, again, we know not that any astonishment on the part of the disciples ought justly to be supposed, inasmuch as it often happened that they did not fully comprehend the teachings of Jesus at the time of their delivery—did not appreciate the entire extent of their meaning. One instance of this is now present to our recollection, as recorded in Luke xviii: 31-34.

The Unitarian exposition of the passage, which Mr. Wilson sets forth, is to the effect that Jesus does not mean he will *personally* be present at assemblages of his disciples, but that his "*devout and benevolent spirit*" will be with them. But no similar passage supports this view. When St. Paul speaks, though absent, of being present with those he may be addressing, he always qualifies the expression by adding "*in the spirit*" (vid. 1 Cor. v: 3-5). "*Though I be absent in the flesh,*" he writes to the Colossians, "*yet am I with you in the spirit*" (ii: 5). Rammohun, Roy, and others, also make reference to Luke xvi: 29, as to a similar clause: "*Abraham saith unto him, 'they have Moses and the prophets: let them hear them.'*" If Moses and the prophets had been introduced as saying, "*They have us: let them hear us,*" we should be disposed to consider the passages before us as somewhat correspondent. No one denies that often in the New Testament, Christ and other teachers are spoken of figuratively, as of the body of doctrines they inculcated, or of the spirit of those doctrines. Yet nowhere in the Sacred Book, nor in the range of universal language, is there to be found an instance where one speaks of himself, figuratively, as of his doctrines or as of their spiritual essence. Such an expression would be anomalous and monstrous. Especially is such an unnatural figure foreign to the simple language of our Saviour and his inspired followers.

Christ, then, we think, means what he says: wherever "*two or three,*" of any time or country (for the expres-

sion is general), "are gathered together in my name, there am *I* (personally, and not figuratively) in their midst."

The second passage in Matthew, which we wish here to notice, is the last in his Gospel: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations . . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, *I am with you alway, [even] unto the end of the world.*"

Unitarians, generally, explain this passage, as does Mr. Wilson, by translating the words *ἐώς τῆς οὐρανείας τοῦ αἰώνος, unto the end of the age*; so as to escape the affirmation of Christ's omnipresence, which in the common version seems to be made. They say that Christ could have meant, if he referred at all to personal presence, only that he would be with his disciples until the end of the Jewish world, in the destruction of Jerusalem. In chapter xxiv: 3, of the Gospel before us, it would at first sight seem that the expression in question holds that meaning: but it is very probable that his disciples expected the end of the world and the destruction of Jerusalem to be simultaneous. Certain it is that Christ predicted the two events in that duplicate form of prophecy which is so often noticeable in the Old Testament. The same expression, however, is found in Matth. xiii: 39, 40 and 49, indisputably meaning *the end of the world*. Such a meaning, therefore, being not only possible, but probable, in the passage under consideration, we are disposed to accept it as securing to the last words of our Saviour infinitely greater importance and wider application. In giving that commission forth which was only to be fulfilled by the teaching of all nations in the doctrines he delivered, it would ill accord with the infinite and eternal dignity of the theme, to assure his own personal aid toward that fulfillment for the paltry interval of some forty years. The solemn manner of his delivery of the promise, speaks of better things than this: "lo, I am with you *alway* (*παντας τας ἡμέρας, through all the time*) unto the end of the world." Let us for a moment adopt the Unitarian exposition. This, then, would be the substance of Christ's last words: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go, then, and teach all nations,

baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you : and, behold, I am with you *all time for forty years.*" The incongruity is hideous ; and to escape it, Unitarians are forced to affirm that the commission here given, as the aid promised, pertains only to those addressed, and is limited by the destruction of Jerusalem. So that John, who certainly survived that event, was after its occurrence freed from all obligation to propagate the gospel, and left without the aid of a present and sustaining Saviour. But of this phase of error we shall have occasion more fully to speak hereafter.

Not entirely satisfied with this exposition of the passage in question, Mr. Wilson resorts to the hypothesis of figurative expression, of which we have just seen a similar application. To defend it here, he makes use of the following argument: "The phraseology employed by Christ is not without parallel in current modes of speech. It is usual for good men, in parting with those for whose welfare they have a most affectionate regard, to exclaim, that, in whatever parts of the world their friends should sojourn—*there* will their hearts, their spirits, their warmest wishes, go along with them ; but from this language no one would infer that any claim is put forth to the divine attribute of ubiquity."

Certainly not ; and had Christ said only, "lo, my heart, my warmest wishes, are with you alway," no one would have dreamed of inferring from the expression his omnipresence. On the other hand, if any "good man" should say to a parting friend, "lo, *I* am with you alway," or " *I* will go along with you," his friend would undoubtedly infer that the man intended personally to accompany him, or, if certified that he had not nor could have such intention, would infer that the "good man" was a fool.

We shall examine briefly, in the next place, several passages whose import is similar to that of those already noticed. The eternity and immutability of Christ's divine nature, is established by the two following passages, as well as by others, for a notice of which we have not space. In John

xvii: 5, Jesus prays, “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, *with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.*” Here Mr. Wilson insists that if Christ had prayed for a glory which he possessed from his very nature, and of which he *could never have been devoid*,\* there would be a palpable absurdity in his prayer. “It is probable,” continues Mr. Wilson, “that our Lord prayed not for any glory which he had in a pre-existent state possessed, but for that of being the Saviour of mankind from sin and misery; a glory, which, *in the design and decree of his Almighty Father*, he had enjoyed before the world was called into being.” This exposition, he says, “is sustained by a few passages, in which the same preposition, *with* (παρα), joined to the name of God, is used to denote the *divine purposes and estimation.*” The primary sense of παρα is *alongside of*, or *with*, which sense is undisturbed when it is joined with a substantive in the same *case* with that here found. From this naturally came the derivative meaning “*in the present or abiding estimation of*,” the force of which is well expressed by the primitive idea of our phrase “*in the sight of*;” but nowhere within our knowledge does this preposition attain the sense—“*in the intention or purpose of*,” or, if we may be allowed the expression, “*in the prophetic estimation of*”—which is required by the Unitarian exposition. The passages to which Mr. Wilson refers above, are 2 Pet. iii: 8, and Matth. vi: 1; “One day is *with the Lord* (παρα Κυριος) as a thousand years,” where evidently the derivative sense, we have given above, is intended, and certainly not that of *purpose*; and “take heed that you do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise you have no reward of (or, *with*) your *Father* (παρα των πατρων), who is in heaven,” where the same sense holds. The same meaning is found, also, in 1 Cor. iii: 19—“the wisdom of this world is foolishness *with God* (παρα των Θεων);” which passage would sustain Mr. Wilson’s views as well as those he has quoted, but in

---

\* This, of course, is a mere assumption. His glory it was, doubtless, of which he “emptied himself,” as we have seen, when he took upon him the form of man.

which the true sense is evidently afforded by the meaning we have attributed to the preposition. But in the very clause under consideration we are supplied with the refutation of Mr. Wilson's exposition. "Glorify thou me *with thine own self* (*παρα σεαυτῷ*)," prays Jesus, "with the glory which I had before the world was, with thee (*παρα σοι*); " such is the rendering in the order of the original. There can be no doubt that the meaning of the first *παρα* is simply *with, in the presence of, along with*; and from the connection and similarity of the clauses containing them, the probabilities must lie with the interpretation which gives to the latter *παρα*, that meaning which belongs to the former. It is altogether improbable that our Saviour should use this word, in clauses thus closely related, in different senses, besides connecting the latter with an expression, which in the plainest interpretation of his words, as thus suggested by himself, would attribute to him a pre-existent state of glory and infernally eternity of duration, if he were a mere man, and not the "great God, our Saviour."\*

Secondly, in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the writer argues to show that Christ is far above angels, and in the eighth verse actually calls him God, we believe, though the passage has been a subject of dispute. This occurs in an address to the Son, extracted from the forty-fifth Psalm, and continuing to the close of the ninth verse. The next verse runs thus: "And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish, *but thou remainest*: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: *but thou art the same and thy years shall not fail.*"

\* From the titles accorded to Christ in the Revelation of John, we think his eternal existence and his oneness with the Father, can be established. We will omit any consideration of the disputed passages in chapt. i: 8 and 11. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last," says Christ, in chapter xxi: 13. But in chapter xxi: 6, God, the Father, says: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end." Moreover, in themselves, these expressions indicate the eternity of Jesus Christ. We may, also, remark that frequently in Isaiah, God is called "the first and the last." (See ch. xliv: 6; xlvi: 12.)

This is, we cannot doubt, (because of its connection with what precedes,) another address to the Son of God. The apostle is engaged in proving the superior dignity of Christ to that of angels, from the manner in which they are addressed or spoken of in the Old Testament, the only Scriptures recognized as of divine authority by the Jews, to whom he is writing. Now, this clause can have no reference to angels ; and as an address to God, the Father, it would be wholly irrelevant to the matter in hand, and useless for the purposes of the argument. Therefore, it must be intended for the Son, as the construction of the clauses proves. But, says Mr. Wilson, this cannot be, for in Psalm cii., whence the clause is quoted, the words are addressed to Jehovah, and “Jehovah is one.” This reply, of course, rests for its value upon the proof, which neither Mr. Wilson nor any other Unitarian has yet produced, that the unity of God, as taught in the Bible, is opposed to the doctrine of a *trinity of persons* in the Godhead. As we have asserted, however, that the integrity of the Apostle’s argument demands the application of the clause in question to Christ, we should institute some examination of the Psalm from which it is derived, in order to show that this derivation is not adverse to such an application. The title of the Psalm is : “A prayer of the afflicted, when he is overwhelmed, and poureth out his complaint before the Lord ;” or, it may be translated, “A prayer *by* (or, *for*) an afflicted one.” It is, therefore, probably to be regarded as a prayer constructed, and intended for the use of any afflicted person,—any one bowed down by sorrow and trouble, one whose hopes can no longer find anchorage in aught save the favor of God, and the expectation of his spiritual blessing. The expression of these emotions would naturally lead to some mention of that hope, which was prominent among the cherished expectations of every pious Jew, and one to which he would certainly recur in every season of extreme depression : that of the coming of the Messiah, of the reign of God on earth in the person of His great ambassador. Accordingly we find it so here. “Thou shalt arise,” says the Psalmist, “and have mercy

upon Zion ; when\* the time to favor her, *when the set time is come . . . .* When the Lord shall build up Zion, *he shall appear in his glory.* He will regard the prayer of the destitute, and not despise their prayer. This shall be written for the generation to come : and the people which shall be created shall praise the Lord : that† he hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary ; from heaven did the Lord (*Jehovah*) behold the earth ; to *hear the groaning of the prisoner* ; to *loose those that are appointed to death* ; to *declare the name of Jehovah in Zion*, and his praise in Jerusalem ; when the people are gathered together and the kingdoms, to serve the Lord (vv. xiii : 16-22). Comparing these expressions with the commission of the Messiah as given in Isaiah lxi : 1, there will be found a striking similarity. In verse 23, the Psalmist apparently takes up once more the theme of his complaint, with which the Psalm opens, and in the 24th continues “I said, (or, will say,) O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days : thy years are throughout all generations.” Then follows the clause quoted in the Epistle to the Hebrews. This prayer, then, is made to God regarded as the Saviour and Restorer of Zion,—as looking down or *leaning down* from the height of heaven, and declaring his name and praise in Jerusalem. If, therefore, it is the apostle’s design to vindicate, on the authority of the Old Testament, the divinity of our Saviour, he rightly uses the words addressed to God in the character of our Saviour and Redeemer, as equivalent to an invocation of the Messiah, our Redeemer, as God.

Moreover, in this clause there is accredited to Christ the creation of the universe ; which is, also, done in other passages in the New Testament. Paul says, in Col. i : 16 ; “by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in the earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers ; *all things* were

\* This word is translated “for,” in the common version. The Hebrew particle (*בְּ*) is susceptible of and often requires the meaning given above.

† In the common version, “for.”

created by him and for him." The phrase "all things" frequently bears a restricted sense, and Unitarians contend that here, also, it has not its widest signification. The opposite view, we think, could easily be maintained. But we need not delay ourselves with the proof; for in John, 1: 3, we have the amplest testimony to the fact we are endeavoring to establish, put in so emphatic a form, and so accurate and clear a manner, as to preclude all discussion:—" *All things* were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made."

The absolute supremacy of Christ is, in our opinion, established by a passage in the same gospel from which we have last quoted:—" He that cometh from above is *above all*: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is *above all*" (John iii: 31). These words are spoken by John the Baptist, and, we think, constitute an explanation or defense of a parallel he draws between Christ and himself in the two verses immediately preceding;—being a comparison, generally applicable, between Christ and any mere "earthly" personage. The phrase "cometh from above," as also the corresponding one, "cometh from heaven," Mr. Wilson explains as equivalent to "sent from God," which is applied to John the Baptist himself, in verse six of the first chapter. Hence, he argues, the expression "above all" can only assert his supremacy over other prophets "sent from God." But the assumption upon which this argument proceeds,—as to the meaning of the phrase "cometh from above,"—is wholly gratuitous, unsustained by any proof whatever, and virtually begs the question. That there is a distinction drawn, in the passage before us, between Christ and those who are "of the earth, earthly," or, in other words, who are mere men, is too plain to be disputed about.

The title "Son of God" is undoubtedly indicative of the divinity of Christ. Nothing can be urged against this view of the phrase, from passages where no indications exist to determine its meaning. Connected with some clauses in which it occurs, there are circumstances which incontrovert-

ibly demonstrate the sense we have given, to have been its popular acceptation. On two occasions the Jews showed that they understood the title, as one which asserted equality with God. (Vide John v: 17, 18; x: 30, 33; et vid. supra.) The high-priest, also, before whom Christ's accusers brought him, on his confessing himself the *Son of God*, "rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy," (Matt. xxvi: 65). He had conjured Jesus to tell "whether he were *the Christ*, the Son of God;" and Unitarians, from this and similar passages, attempt to prove that the terms *Christ* and *Son of God* were exchangeable in the common acceptation; but, as they themselves insist, in the expectation of the Jews the Messiah was a mere man; and, therefore, if *Son of God* is equivalent to *the Christ*, the high-priest and all his audience proved themselves not only execrable knaves, but arrant fools, in accusing Jesus of blasphemy in such connection. It is evident, we think, that the question put by the high-priest virtually constituted two,— "whether thou be the Christ *and* the Son of God?" This opinion is sustained by the record Luke has given of the same event, in which the two questions are separately asked, (Luke, xxii: 67, 71). Again those who passed by the cross, "reviled him, saying . . . If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross;"—evidently understanding such a title as claiming supernatural or divine power; as also did the centurion and his soldiers, who, when they "saw the earthquake and those things that were done, feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God (or, *a son of God*)."<sup>\*</sup> In what *peculiar* sense this title was bestowed by the Apostles, may be gathered from Rom. viii: 3 and 32:—"God sending *his own Son* (*τον ιαυτον υιον*) in the likeness of sinful flesh," and "He that spared not *his own Son* (*τον ιδιον υιον*):"—which Mr. Wilson has attempted, feebly, to explain away.

Many are the passages which, by comparative exposition in connection with others, may be shown to uphold with

---

\* Matt. xxvii: 39, 40; see, also, verses 43, 54, and Mark xxv: 39.

their united testimony the doctrine of Christ's divinity. These, with many others, we must pass by, as our space is limited, and notice, lastly, one which, as it were, reiterates and sums up all that we have already found testified in the passages examined. This occurs in Col. ii: 9. "In him," says the apostle, "*dwelleteth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, (εν αυτῳ κατοικει παν το πληρωμα της θεοτητος σωματικος).*"

Mr. Wilson opens his observations upon this passage by deplored the fact that, whilst its "appearance and sound" are favorable to the doctrine of Christ's divinity, such fallacious accompaniments should be accepted as a criterion of truth. Admitting that the acceptance of such a criterion would afford no lack of evidence for the doctrine in question, he justly affirms that it would lead us, also, to great absurdities. "Yet," he continues, "strange to say! this very mode of interpreting Scripture is employed by men who, in other respects, are acute and judicious. These words—'In Christ dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily'—seeming to harmonize with their preconceived opinion, that the Saviour is Almighty God, they adduce the passage with undoubted confidence of its perfect suitability." Now, if this accusation, so serious and severe, should be shown to fall back justly upon the accuser, it must do so with far more than its wonted force and virulence. His argument against the Trinitarian acceptation of the clause in question, is that a similar interpretation of Eph. iii: 19 would lead to the absurd conclusion that those addressed participated, also, in the "essence of the Deity." Paul tells the disciples to whom he writes, that he prays that they "being rooted and grounded in love may be able . . . . to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge; that they might be *filled with all the fulness of God.*" The "fulness of God" and the "fulness of the Godhead," then, Mr. Wilson takes as equivalent, *himself misled by the "sound and appearance."* The "fulness of God" he properly explains as meaning the blessings and benefits conferred by the gospel, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit;—these *blessings and good gifts* being thus expressed

through a sort of personification, by the name of their Source, Author and Possessor. But a personification, so to speak, into the abstract idea of deity is impossible,—the very terms being contradictory. In Christ, says Paul, *dwells all the fulness of deity* in a corporeal form, or in the flesh ;—if this has any meaning which is not a mockery, it is that Christ is God incarnate.

But again, the expression, “fulness of God,” may reasonably be interpreted otherwise than as a figure of speech. The phrase “of God” is frequently used to express *strength, excellence, perfectness*. There is an instance of this in the chapter containing the clause before us,—in the nineteenth verse,—where the apostle speaks of Christ as the “Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment, ministered and knit together, increaseth with *the increase of God* ;”—the meaning being, *with great, excellent, or perfect increase*. There are other passages in the writings of Paul to which a similar interpretation applies, as, for instance, Rom. x: 2. So here the meaning may be—“all excellent, or perfect fulness.” Or, the clause may be regarded as affording an instance of that Hebraism we have already noticed as frequent in the sacred writings, and which would give the meaning “all godly fulness.” This view is borne out by the last clause of the fourth chapter in this epistle, where Paul says Epaphras prays fervently that the Colossian disciples “may stand perfect and complete in (or, *filled with*) all the will of God,” that is, “perfect and complete in all godly will.” Similarly in 1 Tim. vi: 11, and 2 Tim. iii: 17, “man of God” means godly man. We, however, care not which of these interpretations is adopted for this phrase “fulness of God ;” as either will equally withdraw it from any possibility of relation to the other expression,—“fulness of deity.” This, then, will remain to be considered in itself, for the discovery of its meaning ; and we venture to say that it will be found not only difficult, but rationally impossible, to wrest from it any other, than that suggested by its “sound” and agreeable to its “appearance.”

Here our labor for the present must close. There are various passages in the New Testament which are as well worthy of examination as those above noticed, but which we must omit to investigate. Among these are a series in which religious worship is authoritatively paid to Christ. Further, evidences of the deity of Christ derivable from the Old Testament are not few nor weak, but from any notice of them we must refrain. We think we have established, by such testimonies as cannot be overthrown, the proper Godhead of Christ;—by clauses proving him to be God, one with the Father, omnipresent, eternal, immutable, the Creator and Supreme Lord of all. In a future paper, we hope briefly to prove the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost, by an investigation similar to that above,—of evidences therefor, found in the New Testament; then to set forth a defensive argument, in explanation of certain passages from Scripture, considered as inimical to the doctrine we defend; as, also, a defensive argument from reason, and lastly the historical argument, together with some further notice of the logical tendencies of Unitarian doctrine.

---

#### ART. IV.—ROYAL LITERATURE.

1. *Oeuvres Complètes de Frederic II., Roi de Prusse, 17 Tomes.* 1792.
2. *Gedichte des Koenig Ludwigs von Bayern, Zweyte, vermehrte Auflage, Muenchen, 1829.* 2 Theile.
3. *The Works of Horatio Walpole, Earl of Oxford. Five Volumes.* London, 1798.

WHAT student of history has not often desired to learn the personal characteristics of the kings and the emperors whose career he has traced? Who has not longed to strip many a

monarch of the insignia of royalty, and see him simply as a man? We have little sympathy with those hypercritical ascetics, who so stoutly condemn the recorded gossip of court *raconteurs*. Many an incident, many a trivial jest even, flashes a light upon the character of the central figure to which all courtiers' eyes are turned. History may indeed be written with such power that we can see great events moving on in stately procession; but biographies and sketches of the numerous actors in the scenes of the past, transport us into the very midst of those busy and brilliant personages, and make us sharers in their joys and sorrows. We should despise no aid which can help us relume and vivify the years that have rolled away. We may go back into the days of our fathers. We may multiply our lives indefinitely, and bring to our daily duties the experience of centuries.

But it is not alone in biographies of kings and sketches of courts that we may acquaint ourselves with the peculiarities of monarchs. We should study them in the writings of monarchs themselves. There is what may be distinctively called a Royal Literature. We propose to glance at the long lines of sovereigns, whose names have come down to us, and see how many of them have attempted to contribute by their pens to our stores of intellectual wealth. If an apology is needed for grouping together these august writers, we may adopt that of Walpole, that "Balthazar Bonifacius made a collection of such authors as had been in love with statues; Ravisius Textor of such as had died laughing; Vossius of chronologers; Bartholemus of physicians who have been poets; and some one else of Frenchmen who had studied Hebrew."

As the oldest of Grecian bards was the greatest, so are the earliest kings, who have recorded their thoughts, pre-eminent above all others for richness of imagination, profundity of wisdom, and power of expression. The sweet Psalmist of Israel, and his son, the Preacher, have enlightened the understandings, and comforted the hearts, and rejoiced the spirits of more than fifty generations by a few

small books, which far surpass in value all other royal literature.

The first of the Roman Emperors also was, as an author, greatly superior to any of his successors. The Commentaries of Julius Cæsar are still, as they were eighteen hundred years ago, unrivalled by any military history. We study them as a specimen of manly and classical Latin, as our guide-book of travel in Southern France, as our highest authority on the ancient Gauls, and as an invaluable instructor in the arts of war. Nero seems to have had a literary as well as a sanguinary ambition. We can understand this, when we remember that he was the pupil of Seneca. It is difficult to say what was his success in writing. Martial calls him *doctus*. Tacitus says that he had seen his poems, and that they were written without any great mental effort on the part of the Emperor. Nero, it seems, threw out some ideas, as he would give orders for his dinner, and commanded his verse-wrights to cast them into the proper form. Suetonius, on the contrary, declares that the imperial manuscripts were much blotted and interlined by the Emperor's own hand. He informs us that Nero meditated on what we should regard as a more terrible calamity to his capital than its conflagration, namely, a poem, in four hundred books, on the history of Rome. If he had accomplished his purpose, he would have proved nearly as prolific an author as Dumas, and by quite a similar process. He actually wrote a poem on the history of Troy. We know of two satires which he wrote against individuals. Most probably he afterwards lent a significance to his sports, as the cat does to her playful interviews with a mouse. One of the imperial poet's most delicate comparisons has been handed down to us by Pliny. He refers to a passage in which Nero compares the tresses of his wife, Poppæa, to amber.

Titus not only wrote verses, but had some fame as an *improvisatore*. Pliny mentions a poem by him on a Meteor. Having met Nero on Parnassus, we are not surprised to find Domitian with him. Valerius Flaccus, in the dedication

of his "Argonautics," addresses this Emperor as one "who is capable of celebrating in verse the conquest of Jerusalem." The great Quintilian degrades himself more than he exalts his Sovereign, when he calls him the most sublime of poets, whose literary fame is eclipsed only by his resplendent virtues. The modest Nerva received from Nero the title of the Tibullus of his age. Pliny excuses himself for writing his light poetry by quoting Nerva's example. According to Martial, diffidence made him reluctant to publish.

The jealous Hadrian wrote amatory poems. There is extant quite a tasteful epitaph to his horse, Borysthenes. Many people who admire Pope's beautiful hymn, beginning—

"Vital spark of heavenly flame,"

are not aware that it was founded, by Pope's confession, upon Hadrian's Address to his Dying Soul.

"Animula, vagula, blandula,  
Hospes comesque corporis,  
Quæ nunc abibis in loca,  
Pallidula, rigida, nudula?  
Nec, ut soles, dabis jocos."

He loved to compete both with authors and architects. But it was dangerous to conquer him. Among the later Emperors, Elius Verus, and his son, Numerian, Valentine and Gratian aspired to poetic honors. Geta had perhaps almost as valid claims to literary fame from his alphabetic dinners. He used to give splendid banquets, at which the name of every dish began with the same letter.

More than a thousand years pass away before we reach the only remaining contribution, which a throne in Italy has furnished to literature. Lorenzo de Medici, the Tuscan Augustus, who lavished his treasures in the encouragement of letters and the arts, and filled his splendid capital with imperishable monuments to his glory, was more than a monarch, deserving the title of magnificent; and more than a patron of poetry, sculpture and painting. In the quiet of

his beautiful villa, at Fresole, he was himself filled with that inspiration which he delighted to honor in others ; and verses of purity, delicacy, and pious earnestness, flowed from his pen. He composed not only songs and sonnets, but also plays.

If we turn to the annals of France, we find its first Emperor, and most illustrious ruler, inciting his benighted subjects to intellectual activity, as well by his private example as by his public acts. Charlemagne himself made, or caused to be made, under his personal supervision, a collection of national Frankish ballads, which is unfortunately lost. He actually began to write a grammar of the Frankish language. There is no more beautiful subject for the historical painter, than this old monarch drawing his tablet and pencil from beneath his pillow to improve his sleepless hours by training his stiffened fingers to form the letters of the alphabet. The fine old Latin hymn, "Veni, creator spiritus," is attributed to him. Thibaud, King of Navarre, called the Song Maker, is perhaps the earliest of the French royal poets whose works have survived. His poems, like those of most of the crusaders, are partly amatory and partly martial. They were published at Paris in 1742. The sixteenth century might be called the age of royal authors in France. There was the renowned Marguerite of Valois, Queen of Navarre, the protector of the Protestants, the friend of Calvin and Beza, the author of religious writings, of Miracle Plays, of a French Decameron, called the Heptameron, and of fugitive pieces, which are characterized by genuine feeling and considerable merit. There was her brother, Francis I, whose name is forever identified with the Revival of Letters, and who courted the elegiac muse not without success. Soon after came Henry II, who was warmed into poetical fervor by his ardent passion for Diane de Poitiers. Charles IX. wrote verses which displayed some wit and readiness. We have from him the "Chasse Royale," which has no connection with the famous royal hunt of St. Bartholomew's day, but is confined to the pleasures of the chase. Jeanne d'Albret, the daughter of Marguerite of Valois, inherited not a little of her mother's talent, and transmitted

it to her son, Henry IV. He possessed at once the gift of eloquence and that of poetry. His friendship for Malherbe, and his attack on the imitations of the turgid style of the Spaniards and of the affected manner of the Italians, as well as his own sprightly and natural verses, display his correctness of taste. Few songs are more thoroughly French than his "charming Gabrielle."

None of the later Bourbons has equalled the first of the line. Louis the Eighteenth wrote a very insipid description of his flight. It was little more than a catalogue of what he found to eat and drink. The speeches and dispatches of Bonaparte are too well known to require more than a cursory notice. The works of his nephew, the present Emperor, upon Artillery and the *Idees Napoleonniennes*, are not altogether unworthy of the man, who whether by artifice or genius, has a wider influence in Europe than any other Sovereign, except the Emperor of Russia.

Alfonso the Tenth, styled the Learned, is the most distinguished author who has ever sat on the throne of Spain. His collection of laws, rather than his verses, has given him a lasting fame. Alfonso the Second, of Aragon, holds a place among the Spanish Troubadours; one of his songs, which is still extant, possesses some spirit.

It is well known that a large part of the German Minnesingers were men of noble blood, who were prouder of their wreaths, which they received from fair hands as a reward for their songs, than of the highest ancestral honors. Not a few of them were of princely or royal rank. We find among them such names as the Emperor Henry, Henry the Fat, of Anhalt; Otto, Margrave of Brandenburg; Henry, Duke of Breslau; and Wenceslaus, King of Bohemia. With a rich and melodious tongue, and a hundred different rhythms, they sang of spring-time and flowers, and love, in notes that thrilled the heart and brought the tremulous tear to the eye. Charles IV., the father of Wenceslaus, left an unfinished history, entitled "Commentaria de vita Caroli IV, Bohemiæ Regis, et postea, Imperatoris IV." After the days of the minstrels' glory depart, a long period elapses

before a single one of the numerous crowned heads adds anything to the literature of his country, and when we reach the works of Frederic the Great, we do not regret that all his ancestors were not authors. He, himself, gives us twenty-three octavo volumes, in French, on almost every kind of topic. Politics, history, military affairs, poetry, metaphysics, religion, are all treated by him, either in formal works or in his letters. The very fact that he could write such a quantity, and yet not neglect the manifold arduous duties which he imposed on himself, shows that he was possessed of great activity and high literary aspirations. But he was far greater with his sword than with his pen. His writings live rather as a curiosity than as a valuable addition to the sum of human learning.

Who has not heard of King Ludwig of Bavaria? He has more enduring titles to fame than those which have made his name most widely known in our land. He has been one of the most intelligent and liberal patrons of Art. He has also written poetry. Every one who has strolled around the Hofgarten, at Munich, remembers the inscriptions which he has placed over the frescoes on the walls. The two volumes of poems which he published many years ago, contain some pieces of sterling worth. His fondness for participial constructions, has called forth a parody on his style, which bids fair to transmit to posterity one of his peculiarities as a writer, and one of his mistakes as a man. It is, on the whole, charitable to hope that his reputation will not depend chiefly on his poetry.

If we review the history of Sweden, we see that her throne has, more than once, been occupied by an author. Charles IX. wrote a "Chronique rimée de Suéde," which is very often cited. And where shall we find a queen more renowned for intellectual gifts than Christina? She was as learned as Elizabeth of England, and perhaps possessed of greater powers of expression. We have, from her pen, *Reflections on the Life and Deeds of Alexander the Great*, her favorite hero; *Memoirs of her Life*, distinguished for their impartial judgment of herself; and *Endymion*—an Italian Pastoral, of

which she formed the plan and wrote some strophes, and then entrusted its completion to Alexander Guidi.

The immortal Alfred, of England, was as renowned for his literary, as for his civil and military undertakings. While patronizing authors with royal generosity, he himself translated a number of works—St. Austin's *Soliloquies*, Pope Gregory's *Pastoral Care*, the venerable Bede, Boethius *de Consolatione*, and Orosius. To this last he added much valuable matter concerning the Teutonic nations, and voyages towards the North Pole and to the Baltic. It is said that he began to translate the Psalms. His fondness for hawking led him to write a treatise called *de custodiendis Accipitribus*. Some other small works are attributed to him. When we remember the many great deeds of his life, his bodily infirmities, and the state of learning at his time, we cannot but be amazed that he accomplished so much with his pen. Worthy was he to lay the foundations of the Empire which has produced so many of the rarest geniuses of the world !

Richard, the Lion-Hearted, might be reckoned among the Troubadours, for his celebrated poem, or song is in Provençal. It has more merit than the great majority of poems of that age. The biographers of Henry VIII., assure us that the number of his works is equal to that of his wives, even if we do not count the polemical treatise against Luther, which Luther himself did not credit to the royal pen. It sounds strangely to hear the following titles to works of the cruel and sensual king, *de christiani hominis institutione*, *de instituenda pube*, *A Book of Prayers*. His unfortunate queen, Catherine Parr, wrote several pious works, which are more edifying than those of her royal consort. Edward VI. is the author of some religious and controversial treatises, and it is said that he wrote a comedy called “The Whore of Babylon.” It was doubtless a tirade against Popery. Queen Mary left three prayers, or meditations.

By far the most learned of England's queens, was Elizabeth. She not only read and spoke several languages with facility, but she also left a large number of essays, transla-

tions, speeches, prayers and meditations. Walpole gives a list of twenty of her works, and names several curious and important letters which are extant. It was her practice to read or write something every day. She was not a little susceptible to the praises which were conferred on her writings. It would seem from the words of an old writer, quoted by Walpole, that she possessed the poetic gift. "Last in recital and first in degree, is the queen, our sovereign lady, whose learned, delicate, noble muse, easily surmounteth all the rest that have written before her time or since, for sense, sweetness or subtilty, be it in ode, elegy, epigram, or any other kind of poem, wherein it shall please her majesty to employ her pen, even by as much odds as her own excellent estate and degree exceedeth all the rest of her most humble vassals." We know that in poetical repartee, whether in Latin or in English, she was remarkably quick and witty.

Every school child has heard of the writings of the Pendant King, James I. Besides his "Dæmonology," "Basili-on Doron," and "A Counterblast to Tobacco," there is extant a volume of "His Majesty's Poetical exercises at vacant hours," which is preserved only by the "divinity that doth hedge a king." The authorship of the Eikon Basilike, ascribed by some to Charles I., and published in his works, has been about as much discussed as that of the Letters of Junius. We have some pieces certainly from his pen, which do not give us a very exalted opinion of his talent, though they are not devoid of good sense. Two or three volumes of Memoirs and Meditations are imputed to James II. He had ample leisure, in the closing years of his life, to draw the picture of his more prosperous days.

James I., of Scotland, is ranked as second only to Chaucer among the poets of his time. The only piece which is known to be his, is, "The King's Quhair." It is characterized by great delicacy and naturalness. The unhappy Mary, Queen of Scots, was certainly superior in poetic delicacy and power of expression, to her royal cousin, Elizabeth. She is claimed by the French as one of their poets, since her training and her temperament were French, and her poems were written

in the French language. She wrote Latin with ease and elegance. Her "Lamentation on the Death of her Husband," Francis II., must be considered not only as one of the best poems ever written by a sovereign, but as one of the very best productions of the brilliant sixteenth century. And with her we dismiss the illustrious assembly. We trust that this rapid review of the works of royal authors will show that some of them are worthy the study of us all. It is well for us to see human nature from every point of view. The observations and meditations of a monarch often discover or suggest truths that escape the great mass of men. The world presents itself to him in a peculiar light. Let us thank him if he transmits a truthful picture of it to posterity.

---

#### ART. V.—A HOLY MINISTRY.

IT was the opinion of Abraham Booth, that there will be more professed ministers of the Gospel "finally lost," in proportion to their number, than of any other class professing godliness. However this statement may be regarded, it should by no means be taken for granted, that a man is a Christian because he occupies a Christian pulpit, or has been inducted into the ministry. The same tests of piety should be applied to him by the people which he applies to them. And unless, in practical life, there is harmony between his conduct and the principles of the gospel, by none should he be recognized as a Christian. In this respect, his official position gives him no advantage over others. The Papal notion of infallibility in the priesthood should find no favor among Protestants. The pathway of the Christian Church is strewed with moral wrecks which are admonitory upon this subject. They are found from the time when Judas fell, all along to the present time. No subject is invested with more interest, as connected with the progress of

truth in the earth, than *holiness in the Christian Ministry*. Holy men and only such, should enter upon the work; and among those now engaged in preaching the gospel, the highest attainable degree of holiness, in the present life, should be possessed.

Ministers of Christ eminent for their piety, may be looked for only in connection with a *Divine call* to the work. Such is our cherished theory as a denomination. We hold that no man should enter the ministry unless moved to do so by the Holy Spirit. Undoubtedly pastors and churches should seek out and encourage young men with reference to this work. But a *pure* desire for it must be the fruit of Divine influence on the heart; though, in the gratification of such desire, they may be materially aided by their brethren. Young Timothy undoubtedly looked abroad upon the desolations of sin with deep and solemn convictions touching his duty, before Paul met him. But the visit and advice of the apostle facilitated his entrance upon the work of preaching Christ. From every quarter the cry is now heard for more laborers. The press, the pulpit, and the platform, are crying aloud upon this subject. And in our great anxiety to meet these wants, is there not danger that *we* may call men to preach whom God has not chosen? That young men who entered upon their studies with a view to some secular calling, may be pressed into the sacred work of a bishop without a bishop's qualifications? God forbid that we should lay a damper on the heart of any young men who ought to preach the gospel; or that, in any manner, we should discourage appropriate effort on the part of others to aid in every way the man of God, on whose heart the Holy Spirit has laid the great commission. But if we would contribute to the supply of a *holy ministry* for the world, this point must be sacredly and sedulously guarded. God calls no man to preach the gospel who does not experimentally know its power. And just so far as our arrangements harmonize with the Divine, will the young men who go forth to preach Christ's gospel be of the right stamp. It is with the ministry as with a Church. An organization bearing

the Christian name, which does not make regeneration a test of membership, will necessarily be corrupt in practice, and powerless in its influence for good upon the world. The present condition of the religious establishments in the Old World, furnish ample testimony upon this subject. And the character of hundreds who minister at their altars is traceable to the same cause. Neither regeneration by the Holy Spirit, nor a Divine call to the work of the ministry, is recognized. Hence the moral corruption among the people, and moral inefficiency in the ministers, though possessing a high degree of intellectual vigor. As before remarked, as a denomination, our theory upon this subject is correct. But theory and practice are not always in harmony with each other. And herein lies our danger. If not to apply rigidly the test of regeneration to every one who asks for baptism, contributes to the deterioration of moral power in our churches, so laxness in principle or practice upon the subject of a Divine call for the work of preaching Christ, may indeed be productive of an increase of men, but not of men bearing in every part, and reflecting in every direction, the moral image of God.

Our theme derives force from the consideration, that a minister's usefulness, other things being equal, is graduated by his attainments in holiness.

About twenty years ago, a young man went from the Northern part of the State of New-York to study in a literary and theological institution, with a view to the ministry. In conversation with a physician just before leaving, he was addressed substantially as follows: "I would advise you to study, for if you get an education, you can preach, whether you have much religion or not." Whatever may be thought of this advice, with the reason assigned, in a sense it is true. Profound thought, invincible logic, polished rhetoric, and gospel truth, may meet in a sermon with but little religion either in the heart or life of the preacher. But are these the elements of a minister's strength? They are undoubtedly important. In this age especially, when strong intellects are grappling with the pillars of Christi-

anity,—weaving their metaphysical subtleties and sophistries into our current literature, culling from the historic page every fact and sentiment which seem to subserve their interest, and by every possible means seeking to undermine public confidence in the Bible, men of intellectual culture and vigor are needed to defend the gospel—men who can bring out in order, and set forth with convincing argument the great truths of Revelation—men who can pass over the track of history, and explode the pernicious inferences and deductions of the Infidel. But we repeat the question, are these literary attainments and intellectual might the chief elements of strength in a minister? If so, then we have *only* to ask that the literary and theological institutions of the country will furnish for our pulpits men of well developed powers of mind,—men of mark for their scholarship and general learning. Such men are indeed needed; but if there be not also eminent personal holiness, both the church and the world will be disappointed in the result.

It is worthy of notice, that God has always put signal honor upon holiness in the system of instrumentality for the extension of his kingdom. In that delineation of the Saviour's character found in the four Evangelists, this is prominent. Not a word is written of his graceful elocution, terse sentences, smooth diction, racy style, and scholarly productions, about which so much is said at the present time with reference to ministers of the gospel. And these things might have been true of Jesus. But for some reason they were left out, and others written. In the forefront were placed qualities of a moral character. We read of the morning and evening devotions, the nightly prayer, the flowing tears, the guileless lips, and of the tender, sympathizing heart throbbing to the touch of all the wants and woes, temporal and spiritual, by which he was surrounded. The blended light of these moral excellencies constituted him the Sun of Righteousness. Of Barnabas it was also said, “He was a good man, full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and much people was added unto the Lord.” He may have possessed other qualifications more attractive to

the world, but those only are named which introduce us to the secret of his eminent usefulness. How is it, that men of comparatively small mental capacity, and limited literary attainments, are often more useful as preachers and pastors than are many whose intellectual treasures are far superior? Not, we suppose, on the ground that one is educated and the other uneducated. But because one is *only* learned, and the other eminently holy, though somewhat illiterate. The man taken fresh from the plow, the anvil, or the factory, possessing a good share of common sense, a heart full of the love of Christ, and availing himself of such other advantages as are within his reach, will accomplish more toward the extension of Christ's spiritual reign, than can possibly be effected by the graceless scholar, or the man who has run unbidden into the ministry, however eminent his literary attainments. He may not have the fame, may not call around him as much intelligence and fashion, nor secure the erection of as gorgeous a sanctuary. But he will more effectually reach the great end for which God puts a man into the ministry.

We love to dwell upon a class of ministers who have gone to rest. There is a spiritual charm associated with their names and labors. They were hardy pioneers, who toiled in the wilderness that we might have a more pleasant field of labor. True, they were strangers to classic halls, classic groves, and classic studies. They knew comparatively little of the book rules of logic and rhetoric. But they were not strangers to the pages of inspiration and the throne of grace. They studied men, and were eminently successful in winning them to Christ.

Undoubtedly, educated mind, strong intellectual power, the result of thorough discipline, is exceedingly desirable in the minister. But there is danger of relying too much upon an intellectual grapple with mind, a cold, intellectual collision with the world. A plain presentation of Gospel truth with a tearful eye and warm heart, demanding, upon the authority of Jehovah, faith and repentance, will prove more effectual. Young men pursuing a course of study pre-

paratory to the work of preaching, are in danger of unduly magnifying intellectual culture—of reposing too much confidence in superior scholarship as a means of influence and efficiency in their work. Moving as they do for years in a purely literary circle, they are in imminent danger of coming to regard Greek and Latin, Astronomy and Philosophy, as the chief elements of their power. Whereas, they are serviceable only as they render the mind more vigorous as an instrument in the hands of the Holy Spirit. The man of God who would make full proof of his ministry, must, to a great extent, sacrifice a literary reputation. It must be lost in the minister—in the preacher of Christ and Him crucified. If ambitious to be known as a scholar, his energies will be crippled in another and more important direction. He must not seek to please cultivated but unsanctified intellects with scholarly productions, but to ply the conscience and heart with gospel motives and arguments drawn from the three worlds spread out before him.

So inseparable is eminent personal holiness from distinguished success, the subject cannot be kept too prominently before the minds of young men during their whole course of study. They should be made to feel that while ambitious to excel as scholars, they should be yet more anxious to reach the highest eminence of devotion to the cause of Christ; and that apart from this, they may not expect to "turn many to righteousness." I should think him a *very good man*, is often said of some minister of Christ, and in a manner implying that goodness is but an inferior qualification. Whereas, it is the brightest gem among the qualifications of a Christian Minister, and sheds a heavenly lustre over all the rest. We look with favor upon Theological Seminaries. They propose to do for young men what is highly essential—to furnish for the mind a *system* of religious truth—to present in their legitimate relations, and fortify with appropriate arguments, the great and distinctive doctrines of the Christian religion. But, with becoming modesty, we submit, whether in addition to instruction involving the theory of Religion, a course of lectures on personal and practical holiness, should

not be regarded as equally important. If the minister's success depends upon his ability to preach systematic theology, then let the education be exclusively in that direction. But if not, if it be not "by might nor by power, but by God's Spirit" working in the man, then should no ordinary degree of culture be bestowed on the heart. We would not have introduced into our Theological Seminaries, Jesuitical rules for the mortification of our sinful nature. Nor would we have them converted into Papal convents for exclusion from the world, lest contamination should be the result of contact. But believing, as we do, that holiness, if not the secret of success, is yet indispensable, young men should not fail to leave the Seminary, far in advance, morally as well as intellectually, of the position they occupied when they entered upon their studies. It is said that the turbid waters of the Rhone enter the Lake of Geneva, but they issue a crystal stream from the opposite side. Something like this should be the influence of our Theological Seminaries upon the characters of the young men committed to their charge. Better, far better, that our Theological Institutions should be inhabited by the owls and bats, than that young men should be sent forth from them to preach the gospel, more eminent for any thing else than personal holiness.

It is equally clear that a *strong passion* for the work of the ministry is found only in connection with a high degree of holiness.

No argument is necessary to show that an unconverted man in the ministry cannot love the work. Thousands may hang upon his lips with admiration and delight. His learning and eloquence may win for him a degree of fame which but few enjoy. And yet, being unconverted, preaching with him is only a profession. He studied with the ministry in view, was regularly ordained to the work, has no other business on hand, and therefore must preach. He would have been a happier man in the law, in the counting-room, or the army. But to turn to these now is hardly in harmony with his pride of character. It is also true, that a regenerated man, possessing all desirable literary qualifications, may

be in the ministry and not love it. He may love Christ and his kingdom, and yet not find the work of the Christian minister his appropriate element. But the regenerated man, called of God to the work, will love it just in proportion to his personal devotion. Jesus said, "it is my meat and drink to do the will of Him who sent me, and to finish his work." And the more Christ is imitated in his piety, the more closely will he be copied in his work as a Preacher of the gospel. "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up," said the great Teacher. And in order to success in his work, the same consuming passion for it must pervade the heart and life of the servant of God. The same intense enthusiasm that reigns in the breast of the artist, should characterize the minister of Christ. The studio of the former, though a dingy garret, becomes to him a paradise. While converting the rough marble into the symmetrical human form, or transferring to canvass in life-like lineaments, "the human face Divine," he is achieving the highest ambition of his life. There is a concentration of all his energies upon a marble block or a piece of canvass. Agriculture, statesmanship, or any profession outside of his own (though important) what are they to him? He applies himself to his legitimate work with as much energy and perseverance as though there were nothing else on earth to be done. And not very high hopes may be entertained of any young man looking forward to the ministry, or already engaged it, who is not equally absorbed in the work of preaching "the glorious gospel of the blessed God." It must not be a loose garment carelessly thrown upon the shoulders, which the slightest breeze may blow off. It must be a garment fitted to the form, touching it in every part. And such will be the case if the work of a bishop be enthroned in the affections. He must not decide that, on the whole, he would a *little rather* preach the gospel than to do anything else. Entering the ministry in such a state of mind, with a step so feeble and faltering, it probably will not be long before, on the whole, he would a *little rather* do something else than preach the gospel. No, he must feel that he would rather be an humble minister of

Christ, encountering all the toils and self-denials associated with it, than to occupy any other position in the universe—that it is a higher honor and privilege to unfold the riches of Redemption to his fellow men, than to sway the sceptre of universal empire—that he had rather be the humble instrument of saving the most degraded and ignorant soul that beats within the roughest exterior, than be the nation's most polished orator, on whose lips intelligence, beauty and fashion, hang with breathless delight. In our opinion, no young man should be encouraged to enter the ministry who does not cherish such views and feelings. Bishop Hedding, of the Methodist Church, said, just before he died, “I had rather be the poorest Methodist minister on the poorest circuit, than to possess any amount of earthly good.” This is the sentiment of every true minister in whom the word of God is like fire shut up in the bones. And when this ardent passion for the work exists, most cheerfully will the man of God bend himself to the toils, submit to the hardships, and make all the sacrifices requisite to eminent success. In his view there are sufficiently strong inducements to *enter* the ministry and to *continue* in it. They are found in the great commission, the relation the work itself sustains to the glory of God, the edification of the church, and the salvation of sinners. These, independent of any and every thing else, will not allow exclusive devotion to secular employments. It disturbs the quiet of our soul to hear the remark, as we sometimes do, that at the present day there are but feeble inducements for a young man to enter the ministry. Perhaps not, when there is no love for it. But the inducements themselves are just as strong as when the commission fell from the lips of Jesus, and the Pagan world was spread out before the apostles. Does the prospect of comparatively small salaries keep young men out of the ministry? Undoubtedly, in many cases, ministers of the gospel are miserably paid; and a young man of sufficient energy to succeed as a preacher of the gospel, could reap larger pecuniary profits in some other department of labor. But, in our view, no young man is kept out of the ministry by the limited salaries paid,

who would distinguish himself for usefulness should he enter upon the work. And to one who hesitates on this ground, our advice would be, that by all means he should turn his attention to some other business. Fame apart, money apart, place apart, simply to do good should fill the entire circle of his vision. The man who enters the ministry holding himself in readiness to go anywhere, to plunge into the darkest moral wilderness with the lamp of life, to stand laboring with his fire and hammer on the hardest rock, unknown to fame save the honor that cometh from above, and caring for nothing more ; that man possesses the true spirit of his master, and is a most legitimate successor of the first preachers of the gospel. "Here am I, send me." "None of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God. What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart ? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus." Such was the language of one who counted all things loss for Christ. We live in an age when such are pre-eminently needed. Is there not a disposition to seek out as fields of labor pleasant cities and villages, and refined society—while the Jesuit marches with the tide of emigration into the wilderness, regardless of hardships, or even a premature grave, for the sake of his church ? In the Providence of God, the gates of the nations are thrown wide open for the church to go forth on her mission of love. And from no field, calling for help, should men of God shrink, whatever the sacrifices or perils. What account should be made of sufferings, imprisonment, chains, absence from country and friends, yea, of life itself, compared with the dissemination of God's truth and the salvation of the lost ?\*

---

\* Such was pre-eminently the spirit of David Brainerd. He said: "I cared not where or how I lived, or what hardships I went through, so that I could but gain souls to Christ. While I was asleep I dreamed of these things, and when I waked the first thing I thought of was the great work. All my desire was for the conversion of the heathen, and all my hope was in God."

Our space will not admit of pursuing this subject to an extent which its importance demands. Allow us, however, a few additional thoughts.

It would be unreasonable to demand perfection in the ministry, or to adopt the sentiment that the common imperfections of human nature, in its best state on earth, render a man unfit to preach the gospel. Upon this subject, requirements and expectations may be exorbitant; and imperfections even, may be unduly magnified, both by the Church and the world, because found in the public servants of Christ. A modern writer holds the following language upon this subject:

"It is too much to expect that the ministers of Christ should be perfect men; defects in their character are what the church and the world must always look for. We have no objection to perfect ministers if we could find them; but all whom we have ever yet seen, had something to confess and be forgiven, and much need to grow better. There is no man that liveth and sinneth not; there is no living minister, and none who ever did live, but those who knew him best, were able to detect some discernible blemish, some weak spot in his personal character. We are not apologists for human imperfection; yet do we pity the man who, in this fallen world, expects to find everything in his minister to gratify either his piety or his pride. He can have little knowledge of himself, and little of that charity which hopeth all things, and covereth a multitude of sins, if he cannot appreciate true excellence because it has blemishes. It were a rare combination to find any one man possessing all the personal qualifications that are to be desired in those who minister at the altar. The *beau-ideal* may be a very agreeable picture to the imagination; but it never will be realized. It was indeed once realized, but it was too unearthly for this lower world, too pure for men to look upon; they defiled it, yea spit upon it, and smote it with their hands, and exclaimed, let him be crucified."

To this we fully subscribe. But while those of us engaged in the work of preaching must confess our faults, and while we cherish not the vain expectation that a perfect generation of ministers are to follow us—neither to excuse ourselves nor them, will we withhold the sentiment that *pre-eminent holiness* should reign throughout the ministry of reconciliation. Neither prelatical hands, nor official dignity, nor intellectual greatness, will answer as a substitute for this heaven-descended qualification. It is sometimes said that ministers of the Gospel are under no more obligation to be holy men, than are the great mass of professing christians. However this may be in point of strict obligation, we feel prepared to say that the minister of Christ should be more

eminent for his piety than are the great majority of Christians. His superior advantages and position demand it. All over his heart should be spread the breast-plate of righteousness. In his character there should be a concentration of all the graces of the Spirit in their native brilliancy. In the Church of God, in social life, in his general intercourse with the world, he should occupy an eminence which will command respect and furnish an example worthy of imitation. Paul says of the christian minister, "he must have a good report of them that are without." Though not angelic in purity, such should be the general drift of his conduct, that those who are of the contrary part shall have no evil thing to say against him. And such a man will have the reputation he deserves. The church will give it to him, the world will honor him with it, and the fruit of his labors will bear testimony to the same effect. "If any man serve me, him will my Father honor." True, in this censorious world, the tongue of slander and vituperation may for a time cast dark shadows over the reputation of a man ; but if *character*, the substratum, be preserved untarnished, there is a moral force which ere long will dissipate the mist cast upon him, and again will the world be allowed to look upon him in the light of a well earned integrity.

We cannot, perhaps, better close this article than by a quotation from a book which should be read by every minister in the land. We refer to a work by John Angel James, on the subject of an "Earnest Ministry." He says :

"Do we want examples and patterns of eminent and earnest piety ; how richly are they supplied both in number and in quality in the pages of our own denominational history. Where is the deep, ardent experimental religion of our ancestors, the fathers and founders of Protestant non-conformity ? What a theologian was OWEN when he wrote his exposition of the Hebrews ! What a polemic when he penned his controversy with BIDULPH ! What an ecclesiastic when he drew up his treatise on church government ! But what a Christian when he indulged in his meditations on the glory of Christ, and gave us his treatise on spirituality of mind and the mortification of sin. What a logician and divine was HOWE, when he produced his living temple. But what a Christian, when in the shadow of this noble structure of his holy genius, he poured out his heart in his work on 'delighting in God,' and 'the blessedness of the righteous.' And then think of holy Baxter, who gained repose from the labors of polemic strife, and relief from the tortures of the stone, in the believing anticipations of 'the Saints' rest.' Was their piety the result of their suffering !

Then, for one, I could be almost content to take the latter, so that I might be possessed of the former. Lead me to the spots, I do not say where they trimmed their midnight lamp, and continued at their studies till the morning star, glittering through their casement, chided them to their pillow, but to those more hallowed scenes where they held their nightly vigils, and wrestled with the angel till the break of day. Mighty shades of OWEN and BAXTER, HOWE and MANTON, HENRY and BATES, GOODWIN and NYE; illustrious and holy men, we thank you for the rich legacy you have bequeathed to us in your immortal works; but oh! where has the mantle of your piety fallen?

God of our Fathers! be the God  
Of their succeeding race.

Here then, let us begin, where indeed we ought to begin, with our own spirits; for what should be the piety of that man on the state of whose heart depends in no small degree the spiritual condition of a whole Christian community? If we turn to any department of human action, we shall learn that no one can inspire a taste, much less a passion for the object of his own pursuit, who is not himself most powerfully moved by it. It is, as I have said, the scintillation of his own zeal flying off from his own glowing heart, and falling upon their souls, which kindles in them the fire which burns in himself. Lukewarmness can excite no ardor, originate no activity, produce no effect; it benumbs whatever it touches. If we inquire for the sources of energy, the springs of activity, in the most successful ministers of Christ, we shall find that they lay in the ardor of their devotion. They were men of prayer and of faith. They dwelt upon the mount of communion with God, from whence they came down like Moses to the people, radiant with the glory on which they had themselves been intently gazing. They stationed themselves where they could look at things unseen and eternal, and came with the stupendous visions fresh in their view, and spoke of them under the impression of what they had just seen and heard. They drew their thoughts and made their sermons from their minds and from their books, but they breathed life and power into them from their hearts and in their closets. Trace either WHITEFIELD or WESLEY in their career, and you will see how beaten was the road between the pulpit and the closet. The grass was not allowed to grow in that path. This was, in great part, the secret of their power. They were mighty in public, because in their retirement they had clothed themselves, so to speak, with omnipotence. The same might be said of all others who have attained to eminence as successful preachers of the gospel. If then, we would see a revival of the power of the pulpit, we must first of all see a revival in the piety of those who occupy it; and when this is the case, then 'He that is feeble among us shall be as David, and the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the Lord before them.'

It was our purpose to bring to the notice of the reader, the numerous portions of inspired truth which bear directly upon the subject. But we will close by quoting a single passage, which breathes the fervent aspirations of the apostle for himself. "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which I am apprehended of Christ Je-

sus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended; but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.—Phill. iii: 12—14.

---

#### ART. VI.—IMPORT OF ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ ('CHURCH').

ON no branch of Christian Theology have more books been written than on that of Church Polity; and yet it is remarkable, that even in the best of these but little attempt has been made to exhibit the true *meaning of the word* which is used throughout the New Testament to designate the body in question. Most writers seem either to take it for granted that it has the meanings assigned it, or else they are content to infer this from the passages in which it occurs. A thorough investigation into the origin and import of the word itself, I am persuaded, is not to be found in the English language. And yet such an investigation, any one will see, must go far to settle the question, as to the nature of the true Church of Christ,—a question which must be settled before the Saviour's prayer can be answered, and his disciples "all become one, as he and the Father are one." Such an investigation is here attempted.

##### MEANING OF THE ENGLISH WORD "CHURCH."

The word "Church," as it occurs in our current English literature, is used in a variety of senses. Webster assigns it no less than nine distinct meanings. Some of these, however, are very unusual, if not entirely fanciful. The following are its ordinary meanings:

1. It is used of a *building* consecrated to religious worship. This is its etymological and most usual signification, being derived from the Greek word *κυριακὸς*—*kuriakos*—which means, "pertaining to a lord or master," as in the expres-

sions, "Lord's Supper," and "Lord's Day," 1 Cor. xi: 20, Rev. i: 10. Afterwards, in the writings of the Greek Fathers, the neuter form of the adjective with the article—thus, *τὸ εὐπατῶν*—was used substantively to mean the Lord's house, or a place of worship.\* From this was derived the Anglo-Saxon *circe*, and the German *Kirche*, whence our word Church was formed. The earliest uses of the word are in this sense, as denoting the house or place of worship.

The following are examples:—"The kyng gef ys men grete giftes, and let arere *chirches* up, that the Schrewes adown caste."—R. Gloucester, A. D. 1297. "For the commons, upon festival days, where they shoulde go to *church* to serve God, then gon they to taverns."—Sir John Mandeville, A. D. 1360. "She was a worthy woman, housbands at the *chirche* dore she had five."—Chaucer, 1390. "Thou hast done sinne, whether in other men's houses, or in thine own, in field, in *chirche*," &c.—Chaucer. Although as early as Wickliffe's time it had acquired the sense of a *religious assembly or congregation*, (for he uses it in this sense in his version of the New Testament,) the fact that it is hardly ever used in this sense in the versions that followed Wickliffe's, previous to that of King James, but is employed by them not as the translation of *ἴκκλησις*, but in the phrase "robbers of churches" (Acts 19: 37), by which they render *ἱεροσύλοις*,—literally robbers of *temples*,—shows that it continued for a long time to be used almost exclusively in its primitive and etymological signification. It would have been well for the world and the cause of religion had it always been restricted to this use, and never employed as the translation of *ἴκκλησις*.

2. It is used of a religious society or congregation, meeting stately at one place:—the *container* for the *contained*; as "cup" is used for its contents (1. Cor. xi: 26—27), and "house" for its inmates.

---

\* See Scapula's Greek Lex., Liddell and Scott's, the Ency. Americana, Webster's large Dictionary, Crowell's Ch. Mem. Man., p. 33, Coleman's Ch. Antiq., p. 177, Schaff's Hist. Ap. Church, p. 7.

3. It is applied to a collective body of individual churches forming one ecclesiastical government, nearly synonymous with *denomination*; as the Church of England, the Presbyterian, the Episcopal, the Methodist Church. As the Baptist denomination is not thus one government or a unit, as are the others mentioned, it is not proper to speak of it as "the Baptist Church." This phrase necessarily conveys a false idea.

4. The word Church is used of the entire body of the professors of Christianity, taken as a class, and in distinction from those who make no such profession. Thus we distinguish between "the Church" and "the world."

Now if the word be so indefinite in its signification, it is manifest that to know its meaning as an English word, in common English literature, will by no means enable us to determine what it means as employed in our New Testament Scriptures.

In our common version the word occurs one hundred and fifteen times—exclusive of the one example in Acts xix: 37, already referred to;—and in every instance it is used as the translation of the same Greek word, which is *ἐκκλησία*—*ekklesia*. It is the meaning of this word, then, that we are concerned to know, and which is to determine the meaning of the word 'Church' as employed in our common version. How then is the true import of this word to be ascertained? The sources of evidence are the following:—First, the meaning of the word in classic Greek and in the Septuagint, or, in other words, its meaning previous to, and at the time of its employment by the sacred writers. Second, the testimony of the Greek lexicons of the New Testament. Third, an examination of all the passages of Scripture in which the word is used. And fourth, the descriptions and explanations given by the sacred writers, of the *ἐκκλησία*.

#### MEANING OF THE WORD IN CLASSIC GREEK AND IN THE SEPTUAGINT.

The New Testament writers did not coin the word, but they found it already in common use, as a word having a

distinct and definite meaning in Greek books, and in the Greek version of the Hebrew Scriptures—the Septuagint. It is obvious that they must have used it in the same general sense, as conveying the same leading idea, as in previous and common use; otherwise it would either have conveyed no idea to their readers or a wrong one. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, to determine what is its classical meaning, and what modifications of this word were effected by its use in the Septuagint.

The word *ἐκκλησία* is formed from the two words, *ἐκ*, *out of*, and *καλέω*, *to call*; and hence it literally signifies *the called out*. Stephanus, and also Scapula, define it, "an assembly called out, an assemblage, also the place of an assemblage." Donnegan, "an assembly of the people at Athens, convoked by heralds; also the place of assembly." Liddell and Scott, "an assembly of the citizens, summoned by thecriers, the legislative assembly."

Eschenburg, in his "Manual of Classical Literature," page 509, thus describes the legislative assemblies here referred to :

"Assemblies of the people—*ἐκκλησίαι*—were very frequent at Athens, and had an important influence. In these the acts of the senate were canvassed, laws were proposed and approved or rejected, magistrates appointed, war declared, and the like. The place where they met was either the market place,—*ἀγορά*,—or a broad space near the mountain called the *Pnyx*, or the theatre of Bacchus. The ordinary assemblies—*ἐκκλησίαι κυριαι*—were held monthly on established days; the extraordinary—*ἐκκλησίαι σύγκλητοι*—were called on pressing and important emergencies. The people voted by stretching forth their hands—*χειροτονία*,—and sometimes by a mode of balloting, in which beans and stones were cast into vessels prepared for the purpose."

Similar assemblies called by the same name, *ἐκκλησίαι*, were, held in Sparta. See page 517. In this sense the word is often used by Demosthenes, as where he speaks of "the treaty ratified in the *ἐκκλησίᾳ*," and of "an extraordinary *ἐκκλησία* called by the officers," and of "the proceedings of the *ἐκκλησίαι*."<sup>\*</sup>

Some of the later authorities, as Liddell and Scott even, restrict the word, as found in classic Greek, to this mean-

\* See Champlin's *Demos. on the Crown*, pp. 8, 10, 19, &c.

ing alone. To the same effect is the statement of the learned Trench. "'Εκκλησία," he says, "as all know, was the lawful assembly in a free Greek city of all those possessed of the rights of citizenship, for the transaction of public affairs." An able article in favor of the same view, was published in volume twentieth (July No.) of this Review. But while this was doubtless the original and more usual signification of the word, it certainly was used to designate *any popular assembly*, any gathering or meeting of persons, formally or informally, for business purposes. In this sense Xenophon uses it, when in his *Anabasis* he says that Clearchus, one of the generals of Cyrus, "called together an *assembly*—ekklesian—of his soldiers."\* It certainly has no reference here to "the legislative assembly at Athens," or of "the qualified citizens" of any of "the free cities of Greece," but means simply *an assembly*, as it usually does when used, as here, *without the article*. Lucian also uses the word in the general sense of an assembly, for he employs it to designate *the assemblies of the gods*, as when he makes it a part of the office of Mercury to call together, or "summon to the assemblies"—ταῦς εξκλησίας κατέτειν.†

In this general sense Luke, we think, employs the word in two out of the three instances of its occurrence in the 19th chapter of Acts. In each of these places it is rendered in our common version "assembly," viz. in verses, 32, 39, 41. In verses 32 and 41, it is applied to the promiscuous assemblage who had come together into the theatre at Ephesus, at the outcry and alarm given by Demetrius and his fellow-craftsmen. See verse 29. The word *εξκλησία* is here used interchangeably with *τὸν δῆμον*, "the people," in verse 30; with *τὸν ὁχλον*, "the multitude," in verse 33; and with *τὴς συστροφῆς ταύτης*, "this concourse," in verse 40. These terms have different shades of meaning, but they all refer to the same thing, and are designed only to give variety to the

\* See Xenophon's *Anabasis*, Book I. Chapter 3. Cleveland's ed., p. 9.

† Lucian's *Dialogues*. 8. "Mercury and Maias."

narrative, and to describe the subject under different points of view.

The writer already referred to contends that the word *ἴκκλησις* is used here in its "primary Grecian sense," as denoting "the assembly of the qualified citizens called together;" and that "it was not the *οὐλός*, nor the *δῆμός*, nor the *πληθός*, which the presiding officer—'the town-clerk'—addressed and dismissed, but the *ἴκκλησις*, which was included within, yet distinct from them all."<sup>\*</sup> We dissent from this view, *first*, because there is no intimation in the narrative of the convocation or assembling of this body—the legislative *ἴκκλησις*—on the occasion referred to; *secondly*, because the address of the "town-clerk" seems intended for the assembly at large, and not for the *ἴκκλησις*, as forming a part of it. His language is, "Ye men of *Athens*," &c. Although this expression might have included only the members of the legislative *Ekklesia*, it is not natural thus to restrict it, unless the context requires us to do this. On the other hand the context seems plainly to forbid this restriction. For it will be observed, that in verses 35 and 36, the "town-clerk" remonstrates with his auditors (the persons whom he addresses) for their boisterous cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," and in verse 37, for having brought out "these men"—"Gaius and Aristarchus—Paul's companions in travel"—whilst they had done nothing to merit their indignation. But it was *the populace*, and not *the ίκκλησις* or any of its members as such, that had done these things. For in verses 33 and 34 it is said, that "Alexander would have made his defence unto *the people*, but when they (that is, "*the people*") knew that he was a Jew, all (that is, all *the people*) with one voice, about the space of two hours, cried out," &c. Here it is manifest that it was the citizens generally, and not the portion of them composing the legislative *Ekklesia* only, that raised the cry. And these, too, it is equally evident, were the persons that in verse 29, are said to have "caught Gaius and Aristarchus, and rushed with

---

\* *Christian Review*, vol. 20, p. 437.

one accord into the theatre ;" and *thirdly*, the allusion of the town-clerk in verse 39, to "the lawful assembly"—*τὴν ἴννομον ἐκκλησίαν*—as it should be rendered, in allusion to the legislative assembly or *Ekklesia* of the free cities of Greece, shows that the body here addressed by the town-clerk, and designated as "*ἐκκλησία*," was the *promiscuous* assembly there convened. Had this functionary intended to intimate that it was an *irregular meeting of the legislative Ekklesia* that he was addressing, he would have omitted *the article* in designating that body, and have spoken of it not as *the lawful assembly*, but *a lawful assembly*.

The authorities and examples given are sufficient to prove that *ἐκκλησία*, in classic Greek, meant, at the time of its employment by the New Testament writers, first, a legislative assembly of qualified citizens ; and secondarily, any assembly called together or convening for purposes of business. In either case it involved at least these particulars :

1. A collection of individuals *taken out of* and distinguished from the general mass.
2. Such a collection consisting of persons capable of personal deliberation—*rational agents*.
3. Such a collection *united* by common interests and mutual co-operation.
4. Such a collection accomplishing its purposes by the exercise of *popular rights*, or the participation of each individual in the affairs of the whole body.

Whatever may have been its "consecration" or appropriation by the sacred writers, it is fair to suppose that the word was used by them of a body *characterized by these particulars*; for these are essential to its meaning ; and hence, to use it in a different sense would have been to render it unintelligible for popular use.

But here it is of importance to inquire what influence, if any, was exerted upon its meaning by its use in *the Septuagint*—the Greek version of the Old Testament, from which the writers of the New sometimes quote.

In this the word occurs *seventy-six* times in the Canonical Books, and in every instance as the translation of the same

Hebrew word, which is קָרְבָּן or some other equivalent derivative of the verb קָרַב. In only *five* instances is it used as the translation of these other derivatives. In all the other examples it stands as the equivalent of קָרַב. The verb קָרַב means, according to Gesenius, "to call, to call together, to convoke, to assemble," and is thus the exact equivalent of the Greek καλεσθαι, the root, and the principal of the two words, from which εκκλησία is derived. The noun קָרְבָּן is therefore, etymologically, the almost exact equivalent of εκκλησία, and is accordingly defined by Gesenius, 1. *a coming together, an assembling*; 2. *an assembly, congregation, convocation.* (a) Specially of the *assembly* or *convocation* of the people of Israel for any cause; mostly for religious purposes. (b) In a wider sense, of any *assembly* or *multitude* of men."

From a careful comparison of all the passages in the Septuagint, in which the word εκκλησία occurs, I can discover but *three* applications of the word, viz.:

1. It is used to mean *an assembly* or *collection of persons for any purpose*; as in Ps. 26: 5, where it occurs in the expression, "the *congregation* of evil doers," that is, "the wicked." In the same sense is it used in Ps. 89: 5, rendered in our common version, "the *congregation* of the saints," but which, according to Gesenius and Alexander, should be "holy ones," that is, "angels"—the reference here being to the heavenly world.\* In 1 Samuel 19: 20, it is rendered "company," that is, of the prophets.

2. It is used of the *common or political assemblies* of the Jewish people, as in Judges 21: 8, where it is rendered "assembly," and in 1 Chron. 29: 1, where it is rendered "congregation."

3. It is used of the *religious assemblies* of the Israelites, as in Deut. 18: 16, where it is rendered "assembly," and in 2 Chron. 1: 3, 5, where it is rendered "congregation."

The word εκκλησία, then, like its Hebrew equivalent, has a definite and restricted sense throughout the *Septuagint*. It is *never used of the Jewish nation, or of a family*. To ex-

\* See "Alexander on the Psalms," vol. 2, p. 278.

press these ideas, the word συναγωγὴ is employed, as the translation of עִירָה which, unlike ἥπα means, among other things according to Gesenius, "community, family, household." It is a significant fact, that ἐκκλησία, is never used to translate *this word*. The authors of the Septuagint understood its meaning too well to apply it to any but *conscious, rational, and responsible agents*—those capable of being "called out." As συναγωγὴ from σύν and ἀγω, "to lead or gather together," may be applied both to active and passive agents or subjects, it was appropriately used in the more general and comprehensive sense in which we find it throughout the Septuagint. The chief difference between ἐκκλησία and συναγωγὴ, as their respective etymologies indicate, is, that the first is used only of *active agents*, while the latter is used both of *active and passive agents*.\*

It will be seen, therefore, that the meaning of ἐκκλησία, in the Septuagint, does not differ materially from the meaning it has in Classic Greek. The chief difference is, that in the Septuagint it is used of *a religious assembly*, as well as of other convocations; and this, without altering its meaning, brings it nearer to its New Testament application. Moreover, in the Septuagint, it is applied to a particular congregation or assembly of worshippers, and also to *the whole class* of such worshippers, considered as constituting one body; as in Deut. 23: 1-3, 31: 30; for although this formed but one assembly, still it embraced the aggregate of all the true worshippers of God—all who professed the true religion at that time. If, then, the New Testament writers intended or expected to be understood by their readers, they must have used the word in a sense which accorded with one or more of these its established meanings.

#### THE TESTIMONY OF THE GREEK LEXICONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The testimony or statement of a lexicon is only *the opinion* of an individual critic, and is of very little importance

---

\* The word συναγωγὴ is used even of *beasts*. Judg. 14: 8. Ps. 68: 31.

apart from the examples and proof texts, going to sustain the statements and definitions given. It is the actual usage of a language in the employment of any word, that is to determine the meaning of that word, and not the mere opinions and declarations of men, however learned they may be. In fact, it is not so much learning as common sense that is concerned in such a decision. The learning serves only to find out the examples of the occurrence of any word; common sense must decide, in view of the context and scope of the passage, what its meaning must be. It is not every learned man that has the common sense or judgment necessary to make a sound and reliable critic. Still, as scholars who are supposed to have devoted more than ordinary attention to such studies, the lexicographers in question ought to be heard. The following is the substance of their testimony as to the meaning of *εκκλησία* in the New Testament.

Scapula defines it, "the universal assembly called to life eternal, who profess the true religion of Christ; also particular assemblies into which this universal assembly is distributed—also applied to a particular family, or to those in it who profess Christ—and to a synod or presbytery, that is, a college of elders." Stephanus gives substantially the same definition. Greenfield, "any public assembly, a congregation, a Christian assembly, a Church." Wahl, "an assembly, that is, a multitude of citizens called out and assembled in a convenient public place. In the Jewish sense, a multitude assembled in a sacred convention—a society. In the Christian sense, a multitude of men called out and assembled by authority of Jesus, through his public criers the apostles, for the worship of the true God—a sacred assembly, a society of Christians; used in a general sense, and of particular assemblies of Christians." Robinson, "a convocation, assembly, congregation. (1.) Properly of persons legally called out or summoned, Acts xix: 39, and hence also of a tumultuous assembly not legal.—Acts 19: 32—41. In the Jewish sense, congregation, assembly of the people for worship. (2.) In the Christian sense, an assembly, that is, of Chris-

tians. Hence the Church, the Christian Church, (1) a particular Church, (2) the Church universal."

These examples embody the opinions of all the leading lexicographers on the subject. And it will be seen that they all agree in the following particulars:

1. That the word means primarily any assembly of individuals.
2. That the word is used in this general sense in the New Testament.
3. That in accordance with this meaning it is applied to individual congregations of Christians.
4. That it is used also in a general sense to denote the aggregate of all such congregations, or the sum total of all who profess the true religion.

A few of the early lexicographers, as Scapula and Stephanus, assign it additional meanings, as "a synod," "a family," "a college of elders;" these, however, are meanings so foreign from the primary and ordinary signification of the word, and so uncalled for by the necessities of interpretation, that they are now by the best authorities entirely exploded.

This much then we may regard as settled, so far as the lexicons can settle it,—that wherever *ἐκκλησία* occurs in the New Testament in a religious or Christian sense, it refers either to an individual congregation or society of Christians, or to the entire body of professing Christians, taken as a whole. This definition certainly carries great plausibility with it, from the fact that it makes the meaning of the word in the New Testament to agree in substance with its meanings in the classics and in the Septuagint. It makes the sacred writers to have written so as to be understood by their readers.

#### THE USE OF THE WORD THROUGHOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In determining the meaning of the word from the examples of its use in the New Testament, we are to keep in mind its established meanings as a word in common use at the time of its employment by the sacred writers; and

from these meanings we must not in substance depart, unless imperatively required to do this by the plain necessities of the case. According to a fundamental law of interpretation, and a rule of common sense, we must presume that the New Testament writers used the word in its ordinary signification, until it is plainly shown in any case that they did not.

The word *ἐκκλησία* has in the New Testament two applications—a general and a special one. In its general application it refers to *any assembly* of persons, whether for secular or religious purposes; in its special application it refers to a *Christian organization* of some kind.

In its general application the word occurs but *five* times in the whole New Testament. Three of these, as already shown, are in Acts xix: 32, 39, 41, where in our common version it is rendered “assembly,” referring in verses 32 and 41 to the tumultuous gathering of the populace at Ephesus, and in verse 39 to the “lawful” or legislative assembly, common to the free cities of Greece. In Acts vii: 38 it occurs in the statement, “This is he (Moses) that was in *the Church*—*ἐκκλησίᾳ*—in the wilderness, with the Angel who spoke to him in the Mount Sinai.” Here it means, according to Professor Hackett, Bloomfield and others, “the *assembly* of the Hebrews congregated at Sinai at the time of the promulgation of the law,”—as described in Exodus xix: 17. It does not mean the Jewish *nation*, but a portion of them—the male adults—“called out” and assembled by Divine command for the reception of the Ten Commandments. The other example is in Hebrews ii: 12, “In the midst of *the Church* will I sing praise unto thee.” This is a quotation from Psalms xxii: 22, where the Septuagint also has *ἐκκλησία*. By “*the Church*” here is meant, as Stuart and Alexander explain it, an assembly or *congregation* for public worship. The Apostle is treating of Christ’s incarnation—his *brotherhood* with his disciples;—and quotes the passage from the Psalms to show that the doctrine is recognized in the Old Testament. “The implication is,” says Professor Stuart, “that he who ‘sings praise in the

midst of the assembly' must be like them, and one of their number."\*\*

In the remaining examples of its use the word is employed one hundred and ten times in its *special* application to a *Christian* assembly or organization. It has been shown by clear and decisive examples, that the word signified at the time of its employment by the New Testament writers, *first*, a legislative assembly of citizens *called out*, or selected from the general mass; *secondly*, any popular assembly called or gathered together for business purposes; and *thirdly*, an assembly or congregation meeting together for *religious* worship. In this last sense it had two applications, as designating, 1. any congregation of worshippers among the Jews; and 2. the aggregate of all that thus met for religious worship: *the whole body* of these; as in Deut. xxiii: 1, 3, xxxi: 30. And these are the only meanings that the word had. Bearing this in mind, we shall be prepared to determine its meaning in any place where it occurs in the New Testament.

The first example of its use is in Matt. xvi: 18—"upon this rock I will build my church." Our Lord calls the *εκκλησία* here "*my church*," and by the expression "*I will build*," shows in what sense it was to be his. "*Build*" is here, of course, used figuratively, for gathering and uniting men or believers to himself as the promised Messiah. Our Lord was addressing his disciples in the character of the Messiah, and by his "*church*" would be naturally understood by them to denote the body of his followers—the subjects of the New Dispensation, just as the *εκκλησία* of the Jews constituted the true subjects of the Old Dispensation. The word, then, seems evidently used in allusion to the *εκκλησία* of the Septuagint, and in the same sense substantially, that is, as meaning *congregation*. And the assurance which Christ gives, that "*the gates of hell*"—or more properly of *hades*, that is of death or the under-world—"shall not prevail against it,"—this congregation—shows that it was not his church considered as a *single assembly or organization* that he

---

\* Stuart on Hebrews, page 317.

meant, but his church as embracing *the collective body of his followers*. No *single church or congregation* of that day has been proof against "the gates of hades"—not one has been perpetual; but the order of things which Christ established, and *the body of his followers as organized into separate congregations* for the carrying out of that order,—this *εκκλησία*, his congregation in this sense—has been perpetual; there has been no age when this church of Christ has ceased to exist, or when "the gates of hell prevailed against it," and there never will be, to the end of time.

The general scope of the passage confirms this interpretation. In reply to Christ's inquiry, Peter, speaking for the other apostles as well as for himself, uttered his noble confession—"Thou art the Christ"—that is, the Messiah—"the Son of the living God." After which our Lord says, "And I say also unto thee,"—that is, "As *you* have made this confession, I, on my part declare, that thou art Peter," (or Rock), "and upon this *rock* I will build, (or more properly build *up*) my church," &c. This is plainly an example of *Paronomasia*; but in what sense was Christ's *εκκλησία* or congregation built upon Peter? Not upon his person—not upon the man—but *upon his preaching*, as was literally the fact on the day of Pentecost, and which was evidently the fulfilment of the promise here made to him by Christ. Through Peter's preaching in one day "there were added unto them," that is to the *εκκλησία, the congregation*, "about three thousand souls." The church, as the organized company of Christ's disciples, was in existence at the time of his uttering this promise, and was only to be *built up* upon Peter. For similar examples of the use of *οἰκοδομέω* in the sense of *to build up*, see 1 Cor. iii: 9, 10, 1 Peter ii: 5, Acts ix: 31.

It is worthy of note, then, that the first use of the word *εκκλησία* is in its *enlarged sense*, meaning "the church universal," and that this "church universal" consists only of those who make a regular and Scriptural profession of their faith in Christ, as his disciples, and are thereby united to his authorized companies or congregations of disciples.

The next occurrence of the word is in Matt. xviii: 17, where

our Lord is giving directions for the disposal of private offences between brethren. In case the offender refuses to hear the "two or three" that have been called in as assistants, the other party is then to "tell it unto *the church*," "and if he neglect to hear the church," he adds, "let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." Here "the church" is spoken of as a definite organization or society, having ultimate jurisdiction in certain transactions. Every rule of criticism requires us to understand the word *εκκλησία* here in its restricted sense, as meaning a local assembly or congregation of Christians. It is wholly gratuitous to suppose that the word here means the eldership, or the deaconship, or any part of a church, as the representative of the whole church. At the time the words were uttered there was no such thing as the eldership or deaconship—for the church was in its infancy, and as yet incomplete in its organization—and if there had been, no reader would ever have understood the word *εκκλησία* to indicate these, for it had never been used in such a sense.

In these two examples, which are the only ones that occur in the Gospels, we have illustrations of the two, and *the only two* meanings which the word has throughout the New Testament, when used in its sacred sense. In every place where the word occurs, it means either a particular local congregation of professed Christians, or the whole body of the professed disciples of Christ—that is, the aggregate not of the *churches*, but of the *membership* of all the local churches. Men are added to the "church universal" by becoming members of the "local churches."\* No man can be a member of the church universal, who is not a member of a regular, local gospel church—a church built upon the model of those established by Christ and his apostles, according to the specific terms of his commission to his apos-

---

\* It may perhaps be in place to remark—once for all—that the author of each article is to be considered *personally responsible* for the sentiments he expresses, and that the Editors disclaim all responsibility, except the general one, that every discussion admitted into the pages of the Review shall be such as seems to them scholar-like, dignified, and upon *the whole* tending to promote the elucidation of truth.—[EDITORS.]

ties.—Matt. xxviii: 19, 20.\* The church universal is not an organized body, or a body so constituted as to form and exercise the functions of one ecclesiastical government. This suggests an important rule by which we may generally ascertain whether the word "*church*"—*ἐκκλησία*—as it occurs in the New Testament, refers to a single congregation of Christians, or to the general congregation, "the church universal." When the church is spoken of as discharging the functions that belong properly to an organized body—as of assembling together, exercising discipline, appointing officers, sending forth messengers, &c.—it is, in such cases, al-

---

\* While such is the view which the laws of language and the principles of interpretation, as we understand them, compel us to take,—namely, that "the church universal" is simply the aggregate of the membership of all the local churches at any one period, and that the term *ἐκκλησία*, therefore, has essentially the same application, whether used in its enlarged or in its restricted sense, in the one case referring to a *totality*, and in the other to a *part or parts of that totality*—we would not be understood as holding, that there are no true believers out of the church. On the contrary, believing, as we do, that faith and conversion must *precede* membership in the church, it is a legitimate inference from our view, that persons may be truly converted and yet never become members of the church. As there may be and are false believers and unconverted persons in the church, so there may be and are multitudes of converted persons who are not in the church. The church, as *the body* of Christ, is an external, visible organization, and the condition or medium of admission must, in the nature of things, be in part external also. The leading design of *baptism* was to serve as a part of this condition. "We are all *baptized into one body*."—1 Cor. xii: 13. The person who was casting out devils in Christ's name, and whom the disciples had forbidden, because he followed not with them, was doubtless a true believer, though from some cause he had not entered the fold of Christ. When our Lord prays that those who should hereafter believe in him might be one, as he and the Father are one, he teaches that men may and do become believers without being ecclesiastically united with each other.

When Paul speaks of "the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood," he alludes to the local congregation at Ephesus.—Acts xx: 17, 28. It is not to be inferred from this, that no other congregations or believers were thus "purchased." And so when the same apostle, Eph. v: 25, says that "Christ loved the church and gave himself for it," he does not exclude Christians of other ages from being the objects of Christ's love and redemption. These and similar passages only assert the special regard of the Father and Son for the church. In other places they are represented as loving and providing for the salvation of all men, and especially of all believers.—1 Tim. iv: 10. To be a true believer, therefore, will ensure one's salvation; and yet this does not prove that one can be saved as well out of the church as in it, or that the term *church*—*ἐκκλησία*—is applicable to believers simply, or to any but the members of the local congregations of any given age.

ways a particular local congregation that is meant.

This two-fold application, in the Scriptures, of the word *εκκλησία*, accords very nearly with a similar application of the word *family*, as commonly used by us. This word, like the word "church," is properly used in only two senses, that is, of a single family, and of the whole race of man. And so, too, when we speak of the "human family," or of family in its general sense, we do not think of it as an organized body, or as a body made up of separate individual families united into one, but as a class or order of beings, made up of individuals belonging to the several single families.

Such we are to presume to be the meanings of the word in the New Testament. Any other application would have been entirely arbitrary, and can be admitted only when it has been shown that the other applications are in any case altogether impossible. Whoever asserts that the word is used in any other sense, assumes the burden of proof. The presumption is against him; and this can be set aside only by positive and adequate evidence.

The following are all the places—twenty in number—where the word means "the church universal." Matt. xvi: 18; Rom. xvi: 23; 1 Cor. x: 32, xii: 28, xv: 9; Gal. i: 13; Eph. i: 22, iii: 10, 21; v: 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32; Phil. iii: 6; Col. i: 18, 24; 1 Tim. iii: 15; Heb. xii: 23. In all these passages it will be seen that the word denotes *a class* of persons distinguished by their relation to Christ as his professed followers. Thus, when Paul calls Gaius the "host" not of himself only, but "of the whole church," he means not any one congregation, but the Christian brotherhood generally. So when he says, "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to *the church of God*," it is manifest that he speaks of "the church" as he does of the Jews and Gentiles, viz. as a *class*. When the same Apostle says that God "set in *the church*," "apostles, prophets, workers of miracles," &c., he evidently alludes not to any local congregation of Christians, for these *extraordinary* offices did not appertain to local societies or congregations, but they were "set" in the church at large—the collective body of Christ's disciples. In several places

Paul speaks of his having "persecuted *the church*." But it was the professed disciples, the members *generally* of *the local congregations*, that he persecuted. When Christ is said to be "the head of *the church*," and the church "the body of Christ," both senses of the word are included—that is, *subjection to Christ* is predicated of the local congregation and of the entire body of Christ's disciples; and this subjection is open and *visible*. When it is said that "Christ loved *the church*," it is plainly "the church" in the general sense that is meant. "*The Church* of God," which Paul calls "the house of God," and "the pillar and ground of the truth," may be applicable to a local congregation, but it seems to refer rather to the followers of Christ, generally, as a whole. "The *church* of the first born" mentioned in Heb. xii: 23, and to which the Hebrew Christians are described as having "come," is evidently used in contradistinction to the Jewish *εκκλησία*, "*the congregation*" of pious Israelites, which embraced the whole body of the true subjects of that economy. See, as before, Deut. xxiii: 1-3, 31; 30. Paul is contrasting the Jewish and Christian dispensations, and showing the superiority of the latter over the former; and he describes the subjects of this dispensation—the collective body of Christ's disciples on earth—as "the church of the first born, which are written in heaven." They are called "the first-born," because, says Stuart, "primogeniture, among the Hebrews, conferred distinguished rights and privileges"—and these are the peculiar portion of Christians; and they are said to be "written," or enrolled "in heaven," to mark their heavenly citizenship, and the nature of their true blessedness. According to the best editions of the Greek text, the term *πανηγύρει*—"general assembly"—is connected not with *εκκλησία*—but with *ἄγγελων*—"angels," and hence the passage should read, "but ye are come to the general assembly of angels, to the church of the first-born," &c.\*

\* See Tittman's Gr. Test., by Robinson, Bloomfield, Stuart on Hebrews; Olshausen and Ebrard on Heb. Revision of Hebrews for Am. Bible Union.

The following are the places—ninety in all—where the word is used "of a particular congregation of Christians. Matt. 18: 17; Acts 2: 47; 5: 11; 8: 1, 3; 9: 31; 11: 22, 26; 12: 1, 5; 13: 1; 14: 23, 27; 15: 3, 4, 22, 41; 16: 5; 18: 22; 20: 17, 28; Rom. 16: 1, 4, 5, 16; 1 Cor. 1: 2; 4: 17; 6: 4; 7: 17; 11: 16, 18, 22; 14: 4, 5, 12, 19, 23, 28, 33, 34, 35; 16: 1, 19; 2 Cor. 1: 1; 8: 1, 18, 19, 23, 24; 11: 8, 28; 12: 13; Gal. 1: 2, 22; Phil. 4: 15; Col. 4: 15, 16; 1 Thess, 1: 1; 2: 14; 2 Thess. 1: 1, 4; 1 Tim. 3: 5; 5: 16; Philem. 2; James 5: 14; 3 John 6: 9, 10; Rev. 1: 4, 11, 20; 2: 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 17, 18, 23, 29; 3: 1, 6, 7, 13, 14; 22: 16. In all these cases it will be seen that the distinctive idea is that of a definite and local society or congregation, organized under one distinct, independent, and popular government. Thus when our Lord, in Matt. xviii: 17, directs the offended brother to "tell it to the *church*," he plainly designates such a body, as already shown. And so when it is said, Acts ii: 47, "the Lord added to the *church* daily," the allusion is to a definite, local body, which was the first local church—that at Jerusalem. And the method or rule of augmentation is definitely stated, when it is said in verse 41, "then *they that gladly received his word were baptized*, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." So, too, when Luke tells us, Acts 14: 27, that Paul and Barnabas "gathered the *church* together" at Antioch, a local assembly is plainly meant. The use of the plural number, which is very frequent, precludes all doubt as to the word meaning, in such cases, a local congregation. The sacred writers *always* use the plural when they have occasion to speak of a plurality of single churches; as "the *churches* of Asia," "the *churches* of Macedonia," "the *churches* of Galatia," &c.

The word church—*εκκλησια*—in the *singular number*, is never once used to designate an association or confederacy of churches contiguous to each other, as in a city or province. This supposed application of the word is contended for by some, on the supposition that in the larger cities, where churches were formed, as Jerusalem, Corinth, Thessalonica, &c., there must have been more single congregations than

one, and yet in each case we find that the body of Christian believers, in each of these cities, is designated by the word "*church*." This is specially urged in reference to the city of Jerusalem, where, on the day of Pentecost, three thousand were added to the church, and where other and frequent accessions were made, till the number of believers was "about five thousand." And from other accessions it is supposed that there were in Jerusalem at one time, "not less than ten thousand believers." "Now, in what place," it is asked, "could such a mass of individuals form a single congregation?" And the alleged difficulty is yet increased by supposing that the number of spectators drawn to those meetings, by curiosity and other motives, would at least be equal to the number of disciples, so as to form, with them, the enormous multitude of twenty thousand persons! Now all this difficulty arises from overlooking several obvious facts. In the *first* place, the sacred historian expressly tells us, Acts v: 12, that "they," the church, or body of the disciples, "*were all with one accord in Solomon's porch.*" If Luke tells the truth, the question is settled; for he declares that they *did* all meet together in *one place*. But, in the *second* place, the objector should have noticed that it is said, in Acts ii: 2, that the multitude assembled on the day of Pentecost, and from which the greater part of the Christian converts were gathered, was made up of men "out of every nation under heaven." Many of these, after their conversion, returned to their distant homes, which must have very much reduced the number of members that attended the meetings. Besides, it is not to be supposed that the whole number that remained could at any one time be present at a meeting. But should the number of disciples have become so large as to render it inconvenient for them to meet together ordinarily in one place, they might have divided into several meetings for purposes of worship and preaching, and yet all together form but one *εκκλησια*, or organized society. If there had been a plurality of organized congregations, or churches, in a city where only one is spoken of, we can see no reason why the plural, "*churches*," should not have been used to designate them. And if a *collection* of separate

churches in a *city* might be called *a church*, why did not the sacred writers call such a collection in *a province*, *a church*, instead of being so particular in all such cases to use *the plural* where more than one are alluded to?\*

As a confirmation of this view, and in order to remove an apparent difficulty, I refer to Acts xi: 22, where it is said, "Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the church which was in Jerusalem, and they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch." Here the same persons to whose ears the tidings came, that is, the brotherhood generally in the city, are said to have sent Barnabas; to do which they must have assembled together in one place, for there is nothing said of their acting by representatives. It is shown, too, by this, that the body designated as "the church" consisted of only a part of the number that constituted its entire membership, for the "tidings" related to the doings of some of their number at Antioch. We are not to infer from this, that "the church" here means only a part of the church, but rather the acting membership, in contradistinction from its entire constituency. The legislature of any State is the body composed of all the representatives from such State; and because less than the whole number of these may be called a legislature, it does not follow that the term, *legislature*, means *a part* of such body, though it may designate the acting body in contradistinction from the entire membership. The use of the term "church" is parallel.

In two places, namely, 1 Cor. xi: 18 and 22, the word *εκκλησία* is supposed, by some, to mean "the place of worship." But there is here no necessity for departing from the uniform signification of the word. The phrase, "when ye come together *in the church*," is similar to that we use when we speak of the national representatives "in Congress

---

\* The case, after all, was not peculiar. The writer has the pastoral charge of a church (with a large colored membership) numbering more than three thousand members; and yet it is but one organized body. Like the church at Jerusalem, many of its members dwell at a distance, so that the attendance at any one time is rarely too large to be accommodated. Different portions, for convenience, may meet at separate places for worship, but still they all belong to one and the same *εκκλησία*, or organic body.

assembled." The best editions of the Greek text leave out the *article* here, and read it, "when ye come together *in church*"—in assembly. The meaning is, "when ye meet together in a church capacity, as a church,"—which they always did when the Lord's Supper was to be administered, to which allusion is here made. In the question, "Have ye not houses to eat and drink in, or despise ye the *church* of God?" we are not to place "house" and "church" in opposition; but the Apostle's argument, according to Dr. Rees, is this, "What can be the reason of this abuse? Is it because ye have not houses of your own in which to eat and drink? Or is it because ye despise the *Christian congregation* to which ye belong?" "This," he adds, "is more in the style and spirit of the New Testament, than to speak of despising *stone walls*."<sup>\*</sup> "The circumstances of the apostolical church," says Olshausen, "were not yet of a nature that Christians could possess buildings which were exclusively *churches*." Such buildings did not exist till the close of the second century.<sup>†</sup>

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE *εκκλησία*, AND THE QUALITIES ASCRIBED TO IT  
BY THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITERS.

The import of *εκκλησία* will more fully appear by attending to the descriptions given of the organization it designates, and the qualities ascribed to it by the New Testament writers. They describe the church at large and also the local congregation, as

*A Temple*, Matt. xvi: 18, "On this rock I will *build up* my church." 1 Cor. iii: 16, 17, "Ye are the temple of God," &c. 2 Cor. vi: 16, "The temple of the living God." Eph. ii: 20, 22, "An holy temple in the Lord." 1 Peter ii: 5, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house."

*A Flock*, Acts xx: 28, "Take heed unto—all the flock—to feed—*ποιμαίνειν*, to tend as a flock—the church of God," &c. Luke xii: 32, "Fear not little flock." John x: 16,

\* See Rees' Cyclopaedia, Article "Church."

† See Coleman's Christian Antiquities, p. 179.

"There shall be one fold and one Shepherd." 1 Peter v : 2, 3, "Feed the flock of God," &c.

*The body of Christ*, Eph. i : 22, 23, "Gave him (Christ) to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body," &c. 1 Cor. xii : 27, "Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." Col. i : 18, "And he (Christ) is the head of the body, the church."

*The bride*, "the Lamb's wife," Eph. v . 23, 25, "The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church." Rev. xxi : 9, "I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife." Rev. xxii : 17, "The Spirit and the bride (that is, the church) say come."

Now these figurative representations plainly indicate *three things as essential qualities of the εκκλησια, the church of Christ*; 1st. That a single church is a local, independent society, incapable of combination and consolidation with other similar ones. A "temple" is such a structure. 2d. That its constituency or membership is such as to adapt it to the service of God, that is, they must be capable of obeying, and willing to obey the will of "the head." Hence they must all be adults, not infants; and spiritual believers in Christ, not unconverted persons; and they must be *outwardly* united to Christ by being "buried with him by baptism :" and 3d. That the appropriate office and business of the church is not to rule, but to be ruled by Christ; not to make laws, but simply to execute the laws which He has already made. These representations accord with the general teachings of the New Testament.

*First*, The apostles teach us that the churches were *distinct and independent*, by addressing them as such, and speaking of them as distinct bodies. Thus, the church at Jerusalem, which may be regarded as a model of all the other churches, is so described in Acts ii : 44, 46, "And all they that believed (which is only another expression for, "the whole church") were together—and they continued daily with one accord in the temple." The supposed instance of church confederacy, in the 15th chapter of Acts, is all imaginary. A delegation from the church at Antioch is sent to Jerusalem to consult "the apostles and elders." An an-

swer is returned containing an authoritative injunction. This injunction they make—not as a church or as a confederation of churches—a presbytery, synod, convention, or council—but *as inspired men*. Their language is, “It seemed good to *the Holy Ghost* and to us.” Can any body of uninspired men, adopt this language? But there is here no confederation, for the delegates take no part in the council, which consists only of the apostles and the brethren in Jerusalem. Besides, the business was of a *legislative* character, related to law-making, with which the church, as a mere executive body, has nothing to do. It was business which inspired men alone could settle.

The Scriptures do not permit any church to devolve upon some of its members, or upon any other church or churches, the rights and duties which belong to itself. Thus each church chooses its own officers, *Acts vi: 3*. And these are only the agents of the church, and are responsible to it for the proper discharge of their duties.—*1 John iv: 1*, *Rev. ii: 2*, compared with *verse 7*. The only church officers known to the New Testament, were the pastor (called also “bishop” and “elder”), and deacons. And these acted in matters of government and discipline only in co-operation with the whole church. This is evident from the fact, that the apostle addresses his Epistles not to the officers of the church, but to the church and officers together, *Phil. i: 1*; and that his instructions, which are to govern any church in the exercise of its discipline, are given not to the officers, nor to a part of the church, but to the whole church. This applies to cases of admitting members, excluding and restoring them. See *Romans xiv: 1*; *1 Corinthians v: 11, 13*; *2 Corinthians ii: 6, 8*. The office of the pastor is to “take care of the church,” that is, of a single congregation of believers; and to “feed,” or tend, the flock of Christ.—*1 Timothy iii: 5*, *Acts xx: 28*. This he is to do by “declaring unto them the whole counsel of God.” The business of the deacons is to “serve tables,” or take charge of the secular interests of the church, and to take care of the poor.—*Acts vi: 24*.

*Secondly:* The Scriptures also plainly teach us, that a

true church of Christ is a company of converted persons, "a congregation of faithful men," baptized upon a profession of their faith in Christ. Such was the "model church" at Jerusalem, which we are told, (Acts, second chapter,) was composed of such as were first "*pricked in their hearts*," or convicted for sin, who then "*repented*," and having "*gladly received the word*," were then "*baptized*" and "*added*" to the church. And the whole church is described, in verse forty-four, as "*all that believed*." This was an exact carrying out of Christ's command, who instructed his apostles, Matthew xxviii: 19, "*to teach—μαθητεύσατε, make disciples of*—all nations, baptizing them," and after thus bringing them into the church, then "*teaching them to observe all things that he had commanded them*." "*This embraces*," says Dr. Bloomfield, a learned Episcopalian, "three particulars; 1. To disciple them or convert them to the faith; 2. To initiate them into the church by baptism; 3. To instruct them, when baptized, in the doctrines and duties of a Christian life." This commission, as Bloomfield and other Pedobaptist writers admit, gave the apostles no authority to admit into the church any but believers. Had Christ intended that infants also should be admitted, he would undoubtedly have given directions to this effect in his commission. It would then have been, "*teach all nations, baptizing them and their children*." This addition to the command is practically made by all who admit infants to baptism and church membership. And with such the addition has almost entirely set aside the command, for with Pedobaptist churches generally the addition has become the rule, and the command itself the exception. Thus have they literally, as our Lord said, "*made the commandment of God of none effect by their tradition*."—Matthew xv: 6. But on what grounds are infants admitted? Not on the ground that they are believers, for "*faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God*." Not on the ground that they are holy beings, for they "*are by nature the children of wrath, even as others*." Not on the ground that they derive a title to the privileges of church membership from their natural descent, their pious parentage, for

this error was corrected as long ago as the time of John the Baptist, when he said to the unconverted Pharisees and Saducees, who had applied for admission, by baptism, to the Messiah's kingdom, on the ground of their natural descent from Abraham, " Think not to say within yourselves, ' We have Abraham to our Father ; ' for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham ; " —the meaning of which is, " It is not to the natural descendants of the faithful that the covenant blessings are promised, but to those who are like him—his children—in respect to character, which a person may be who is not at all related to him by natural descent."—Matthew iii: 9. Compare Romans iv: 11, 18, where this thought is fully developed. Nor are infants to be admitted into the church because they are unholy, and in order to their conversion ; because for the same reason unconverted *adults* ought to be admitted, which would at once nullify the very fundamental idea of the church, as the *εκκλησία*, the " *called out*," and directly violate the command of Christ to receive and baptize believers only.

The church is a voluntary society, and it is absurd to speak of any but voluntary agents being members of it. The Jewish *nation* was no church. It is no where called a church in the Scriptures. The only church there spoken of, as belonging to the Old Testament dispensation, was the "congregation" or "assembly" of adult worshippers. Infants were admitted not into the *church*, the *εκκλησία* or congregation, but into the *nation* by the rite of circumcision, which was therefore a merely political or national arrangement and institution, designed to *perpetuate the Jewish nation*, so that, and until, the promised Messiah might in due time appear from among them. Even if the Christian Church, therefore, were modeled after the Jewish, it would thereby utterly exclude infants from its membership. But the Scriptures plainly teach, that the whole Jewish economy was superseded by the Christian, which is not a modification of that, but altogether a different thing, both in name and nature. " The law and the prophets (that is, the Jewish dispensation) were until John ; since that time the

kingdom of God (the Christian dispensation) is preached, and every man presseth into it.—Luke xvi: 16.

The Apostle says to the Christian brethren at Corinth, 1 Corinthians, xii: 27, “Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.” Every member of a church, then, is a member of Christ’s “body.” And if so, is it not manifestly absurd to think of placing in that body, “members” that are incapable of understanding and obeying the will of “the head?” Again; the members of a church all sustain to Christ the relation of branches to a vine. “I am the vine,” he says, “and ye are the branches.” But he declares that only *fruitful* branches—such persons as are obedient to his will—are allowed to remain even visibly united to him; for “every branch in me,” he says, “that beareth not fruit he taketh away.”—John xv: 1, 5. How improper, and in direct violation of these instructions, then, must it be, to introduce, recognize and retain in this relation to Christ, and as members of his church, *infants*, who are utterly incapable of bearing any fruit at all! No, a true church of Christ has no such carnal, impracticable materials, but its members, “as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.”—1 Peter ii: 5.

*Thirdly:* So also is a church,—as the figure of a body in its relation to the head implies,—a merely *executive* body, charged with the duty, not of *making* laws but of *obeying* them. The head makes the laws for the body. And so the Scriptures represent Christ as the only law-giver, the only head of the Church. It would be a monstrosity for a body to have more than one head; and so is it for the Church to submit to any other authority than that of Christ, whether it be that of a king, a pope, a prelate, or the clergy. The members of the natural body, too, all occupy the same relation to the head. No one assumes the functions of the head, or acts for the rest, or delegates its powers and responsibilities to another; but all alike receive the biddings of the head, and act as a whole in obeying them, though each one has its appropriate office to perform. And such is the Church, as described by the inspired penmen. They

tell us it has "but one Master, even Christ," and that its members are "all brethren,"—Matthew xxiii: 8; that it is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone," that is, upon the authority and *inspired teachings of these as set forth in the Sacred Scriptures*. And hence any "church" not built upon this foundation—that is, not conformed in its structure and operations to these instructions—fails to come within the definition here laid down of a true church of Christ.

Moreover, this foundation is *complete*; these instructions of the Head are all-sufficient; and hence it is said, that "other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid."—1 Corinthians iii: 11. We need, then, no "apostolical succession." A succession of apostles is no more needed, and is no more practicable, than is a succession of mediators. Neither is needed because their work was complete, and because both, in effect, still live, and will live to the end of time. The Saviour's work is of unwasting efficacy, and the labors of his inspired apostles are still dispensed through the written Word.

It is a singular fallacy to suppose, as some do, that the Church was left by Christ at liberty to make any changes or modifications in its organization and government that it might see fit to make. This would be for the Divine "Head" to suspend his authority and control, and permit and expect a society, a "body," of poor, erring, fallen beings, to cease for a time to occupy the position of a "body," and to assume the discharge of the office of that infallible Head!—a body without a head—or a body both body and head at the same time!

Thus simple and unique was the organization of the primitive church. Such is the *εκκλησία* of the New Testament. Let none presume, by altering His work, to be wiser than their Divine Master, who significantly says to his professed followers, "The servant is *not greater* than his lord. If ye know these things, *happy are ye if ye do them.*"

## ART. VII.—DREAMS; THEIR NATURE AND USES.

1. "*The Power of the Soul over the Body.*" By GEORGE MOORE, M. D. Harper & Brothers.
2. "*Melanges Philosophiques.*" Par THEODORE JOUFFROY Paris. 1838.
3. "*The Philosophy of Mystery.*" By WALTER COOPER DENDY. Harper & Brothers.
4. "*Chapters on Mental Physiology.*" By Sir HENRY HOLLAND, M. D. 1852.
5. "*The Poetry of Dreams.*" By CHARLES G. LELAND. E. H. Butler & Co.

DREAMS! What are they? Like most of our readers, perhaps, we have been accustomed to view them as pleasing fantasies which, while well calculated to arrest the attention of the vulgar and the ignorant, only merit the derision of the wise and prudent. As a consequence, while we have sometimes listened with interest to their recital, we have never been disposed to attach the slightest importance to their interpretation, and have always thought there was no fitter subject for ridicule, than the man who should be silly enough to avow even a limited faith in them. Recently, however, we have been led to take more charitable and somewhat different views both of dreams and dreamers, and the conclusions we have reached will be found embodied in the present paper.

In reading the works placed at the head of this article, and which treat more or less of mental physiology, we have been struck with the amount of interest which has recently been awakened by this subject. To give anything like a full analysis of these books would, of course, carry us very far from the specific point now before us. Let it suffice, however, to say that they all dwell, at greater or less length, on the nature of dreams, and may be regarded as good authorities in showing how physicians, physiolo-

gists, moral philosophers and poets, have discoursed upon this great mystery.

Before entering fully upon the topic immediately before us, however, it will occur to the reader that there is another subject intimately connected with this, and demanding at least a passing notice. Sleep being the necessary condition of dreaming, it becomes a matter of some interest to inquire into the peculiar circumstances under which the mind exerts itself, or in connexion with which it is influenced in its shadowy and mystic conception's.

BICHAT, a distinguished French writer, contends that there are numerous varieties of sleep, all depending on the measure in which our sensations are suspended, and holds that dreaming is but a natural consequence of the partial exemption of one portion of the animal life from the torpor in which the other portion is immersed. This, in substance, seems to be the opinion of Lord BROUGHAM, who maintains that our dreams come to us only when the two states of sleeping and waking are graduating into each other. And one of our old poets evidently held the same opinion. Hence, in ushering in his "Dreme," he says:

"Half in dede slepe, not fully revyved."

And again :

"For on this wyse, upon a night  
As ye have heard, withouten light,  
Not all wakyng ne full on slepe,  
About such hours as lovirs wepe."

Sir HENRY HOLLAND, however, in opposition to this theory, thinks

"It is, on the whole, more reasonable to suppose that no state of sleep is utterly without dreaming;" arguing that to believe otherwise would be "to suppose two different states of sleep more remote from each other than we can well conceive any two conditions of the same living being; one, in which sensation, thought and emotions are present in activity and unceasing change; another, in which there is the absence or nullity of every function of mind,—annihilation, in fact, for the time, of all that is not merely organic life."

Very similar to this is the view held by Dr. MOORE.

"It is manifest," says he, "that the thinking and acting principle

does not sleep at all, in the sense in which the body sleeps, when the mind is not using it; for the mind is always ready for action whenever the organization is in a fit state to convey impression and to be employed. As surely as physical phenomena excite sensation during sleep, as in some dreams, so surely do they prove, that during sleep there is no absolute suspension of the faculty of perception. That we awake at the bidding of a bodily necessity, as also we fall asleep, is an evidence that the mind only partially retires from the senses, till outward occasion demands the physical operation of the will."

In perfect harmony with this opinion, also, are the views of JOUFFROY, who contends that the spirit continues its activity during the profoundest sleep of the senses; for, says he :

"When we dream, assuredly we are asleep; and as assuredly our spirit does not sleep, because it thinks. It is proved, then, that the spirit often is awake when the senses are in slumber; but it is very far from being proved that it ever slumbers with them."

Adopting this theory, each of the last three authors quoted presents in its support a series of careful observations and deductions, which go to show most conclusively that the spirit maintains its watch, and is accustomed to manifest its restless energy even when the physical senses are in a state of deep sleep. Yielding, then, as we must, to the force of these arguments, we are brought substantially to the same conclusion; namely, that, while our corporeal powers are suspended, and we rest unaffected by the ordinary impressions of external objects, yet, the mind is not only free, but sometimes marvellously active in its exercises.

Nor is it entirely clear that the *will* is wholly disconnected with the mental efforts through which, at such times, we pass. On the contrary, it would not be difficult, perhaps, to satisfy ourselves by an appeal to experience, that we often exercise as much volition during sleep as when awake, and the testimony of facts upon this point may be regarded as well nigh conclusive. It is said, for instance, that TARTINI, a celebrated violin player, composed his famous *Devil's Sonata* while he dreamed that the Devil challenged him to a trial of skill on his own violin. CONDORCET often left his deep and complicated calculations unfinished when obliged to retire to rest, and found their results unfolded in his dreams. COL-

ERIDGE's account of his wild composition, *Kubla Khan*, is still more astonishing. He had been reading *Purchas' Pilgrimage*, and fell asleep at the moment he finished this sentence—"Here the Khan Kubla commanded a palace to be built, and a stately garden thereunto." He continued in profound sleep about three hours, during which time he had a very vivid conception of images, with an equally vivid power of expression and description. On awaking he appeared to have a distinct recollection of the whole, and proceeded to write down the wonderful lines that are preserved, when he was interrupted, and could never afterward recall the rest.

That volition is not entirely suspended during sleep, is a theory boldly and very ably advocated by Dr. MOORE. While frankly admitting that ideas in sleep are not directed by the same degree or kind of mental determination, as during the periods of vigilance and watchfulness, and while conceding, also, that the being that thinks is stimulated by impressions derived through the nervous system, he earnestly contends, at the same time, that their source is not to be traced to the spontaneous action of an excited brain, but to what he is pleased to style "*the thinking being itself.*"

"Ideas," says he, condensing his view into a syllogism, "are remembered impressions, and dreams are confused ideas; if, then, ideas are mental, dreams are mental." Then he adds—"There are laws under which the soul acts in dreaming, as well as in thinking, and it is often difficult to distinguish these acts." And, speaking of the labored efforts of metaphysicians to explain these laws, he says:

"All their elaborate disquisitions exhibiting the operation of mental function in unison with organization, teach us no more than we previously knew, namely, that the functions of the mind and brain are created to act together at present. They leave us in possession of the capital and most interesting fact, that *we do will* and *we do remember*, but they cannot tell us how. Still they must acknowledge that these wonderful powers result from the operation of some thing or being which *chooses* between pleasant and unpleasant sensations, both *when the body sleeps and when it wakes.*"

But, while there may be room for entirely opposite views on this point, there is but little ground, we think, for any

diversity of opinion respecting the *general causes* of dreams.

ABERCROMBIE, who may be considered, perhaps, the most learned analyst of the mind since REID and STEWART, has referred nearly all varieties of dreams to these four sources:

First. "Recent events, and recent mental emotions, mingled up into one continuous series with each other, or with old events, by means of some feeling which had been in a greater or less degree allied to each of them, though in other respects they were entirely unconnected." Second. "Trains of images brought up by association with bodily sensations." Third. "Dreams consisting of the revival of old associations respecting things which had entirely passed out of the mind, and which seemed to have been forgotten." Fourth. "A class of dreams in which a strong propensity of character, or a strong mental emotion is embodied, and, by some natural coincidence, is fulfilled."

Now, by a reference to these principles we may be able, perhaps, to account for many of our dreams, and yet we believe instances are constantly occurring which are not properly referable to either of these causes; instances which cannot be explained by a reference either to a wrong association of new events, or to trains of thought from bodily association, or to a revival of old associations, or to anything like mere coincidence. The question, then, arises, how shall we account for such dreams, or to what origin shall we refer them? To suggest that their source may be supernatural, might, to some, savor of superstition, and yet who is prepared to deny it?

It is a well known fact that the Greeks, and indeed all the heathen nations, regarded dreams as coming from the gods. A divine origin was thus ascribed to them *indiscriminately*. That this view, however, was not sanctioned under the Jewish economy, is evident from the fact that Jehovah, by the mouth of one of his servants, sternly rebukes some of his prophets for reposing undue confidence in their dreams. "The prophet that hath a dream," says He, "let him tell a dream; but he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully." Yet that the Almighty has, at various times, both under the old and the new dispensation,

discovered his will to men in visions and dreams, is too evident to require illustration or proof. Moreover, that it is consistent with the Divine purposes respecting man thus to counsel and teach him, is clearly implied in that familiar declaration of Elihu to Job: "*For God speaketh once, yea twice, yet man perceiveth it not. In a dream, in a vision of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, in slumberings upon the bed; then he openeth the ears of men, and sealeth their instruction.*" The views of JOHN BUNYAN on this passage are very finely expressed in the comment which he puts into the mouth of Christiana, when congratulating Mercy on the charming dream which she had while in the House Beautiful. "We need not," says she, "when abed, to lie awake to talk with God; he can visit us while we sleep, and cause us then to hear his voice. Our heart oft-times wakes when we sleep; and God can speak to that, either by words, by proverbs, by signs and similitudes, as well as if one was awake." That this was anciently one of the Almighty's ways of communicating with man is too obvious to require proof. At a very early day, He said He would "speak to his prophets in a dream," and he confirmed his word in the self-interpreting dream of ABIMELECH, in the visions of the inspired expounder, JOSEPH, in the first dream of the New Testament, in the impressive trance of PETER, in coincidence with the visions of the centurion, and even in the holy visions of the Apocalypse. And though we would not be understood, of course, to attach all that importance to dreams now with which they were once invested, yet that they occur in obedience to the same laws, and that they fall in with the general scheme of the divine government, and, consequently, are connected with providential designs, cannot, we think, be disputed.

This we do know, that sleep falls upon men at the present day, just as it fell upon them in the beginning, and if, in this state, they dream, it must be from the same general or special causes. What then? Shall we assert that dreams now are ever induced by Divine influences? This might expose us to the shafts of ridicule, and yet, some have not hesitated to utter this very conviction. Says a gifted writer:

"Men are still, as in days far back, 'warned of God in a dream.' A dream! We pass its name about as a proverb for whatever is empty and light and worthless; as if it was shaped only by streams from the brain out of the unsubstantial night. We should learn to think more of it and better of it. As we have seen, it shows the mind watchful amidst the drowsy workmen whom it has for a season discharged from service; perceiving without organs, addressed without language, speaking without a tongue, and looking upon prospects that are not actual, when loosened from all sensibilities. It shows that mind, too, sometimes exercising a dominant and even prophetic power,—for it belongs to mind to be prophetic,—in an extraordinary degree."

Now, if it be so that, while the body is in a state of insensibility, the mind is thus borne forward by some mighty influence into the unexplored future, to what, we ask, save a spiritual source, can that influence be referred? The affirmative response assumed by this query may lead some to pity our credulity, and others may be ready to reproach us for going beyond what they are pleased to consider the limits of rational probability. But with all due respect to those who hold opposing opinions, we venture, at least, to express a conviction that there is often a providence in dreams, and that we may generally use them as ministries of moral blessing. The improvement of which they are susceptible must depend, of course, wholly on their character; but one very important use is suggested in the following passage from a quaint but sensible old author, who, somewhere about the beginning of the seventeenth century, wrote under the soubriquet of *Philotheos Phyliologus*.\*

"If men would but turn their eyes inward," says he, "and learn to know themselves, and the principles and degrees of their own nature, every one might in a great degree understand from what radix and property of nature each dream proceeds and takes its birth, and consequently know their own complexion, and likewise what principle or quality, good or evil, does carry the upper dominion in them; so that there would be much teachableness in *Dreams*, as they are derived from, and demonstrate what property has dominion in the soul."

President EDWARDS, it may be remembered, has suggested this same use of dreams, and in the pages of Dr. MOORE, also, it is thus forcibly presented:

---

\*The work is entitled, "A TREATISE OF DREAMS AND VISIONS, wherein the Causes, Natures and Uses of Nocturnal Representations, and the Communications both of Good and Evil Angels, as also Departed Souls, to Mankind, are Theosophically Unfolded; that is, according to the Word of God and the Harmony of created Beings."

"Our Dreams would well reveal to us the state of our hearts and our habits, for in them our wills are freer from restraint, and our desires are more undisguised by the hypocrisies of waking life. As Sir THOMAS BROWNE says, in his tract on Dreams, 'Persons of radical integrity will not easily be perverted in their dreams, nor noble minds do pitiful things in sleep.' 'Though bounded in a nutshell, I might fancy myself a king of infinite space, but that I have had dreams,' exclaims *Hamlet*. These visions of the night indeed instruct us concerning our characters; and though they are produced involuntarily, yet they test the conscience, and prove the state of our dispositions."

But there are other uses which dreams serve beside affording an index to character. By a quotation before made, they are represented as being, in a certain sense, *prophetic*, and though we are not prepared fully to subscribe to this view, we must, at the same time, admit that singular coincidences occurring in connexion with accredited dreams and well attested facts, have often greatly perplexed us for a satisfactory solution. Take as simple illustrations—and from personal knowledge they might be almost indefinitely multiplied—the following cases, cited by Dr. ABERCROMBIE:

"A lady dreamed that an aged female relative had been murdered by a black servant, and the dream occurred more than once. She was then so impressed by it that she went to the house of the lady to whom it related, and prevailed upon a gentleman to watch in an adjoining room during the following night. About three o'clock in the morning, the gentleman, hearing footsteps on the stairs, left his place of concealment, and met the servant carrying up a quantity of coals. Being questioned as to where he was going, he replied, in a confused and hurried manner, that he was going to mend his mistress' fire,—which, at three o'clock in the morning, in the middle of summer, was evidently impossible; and, on further investigation, a strong knife was found concealed beneath the coals. Another lady dreamed that a boy, her nephew, had been drowned along with some young companions with whom he had engaged to go on a sailing excursion in the Frith of Forth. She sent for him in the morning, and, with much difficulty, prevailed upon him to give up his engagement;—his companions went and were all drowned."

But without venturing an opinion on such cases, and while refusing full assent to the *prophetic* use of dreams, there certainly can be no question respecting their province and fearful power as a source of *reproof and punishment*. The day-star and father of English poetry has given us this admonition :

"That no man should be too reckless  
Of Dreams, for I say thee doubtlesse  
That many a dreme full sore is for to drede."

And terrible, indeed, is the punishment sometimes suffered by the wicked in the visions of the night! Then, while the body only rests in unquiet sleep, the spirit is overwhelmed with sorrow, and writhes in the insufferable anguish of remorse. Then forgotten sins cry aloud for vengeance, and the man who has betrayed no trepidation in his intercourse with society, is made to start and tremble before the shadowy images of his own guilt.

In illustration of this point, we might refer to striking passages in some of the poets. SHAKESPEARE, for instance, makes the coward conscience of Richard to cry—

“By the apostle Paul, shadows to-night  
Have struck more terror to the soul of Richard  
Than could the substance of ten thousand soldiers!”

While CRABBE, in his “World of Dreams,” represents one exclaiming in fright—

“That female fiend, who is she there?  
Alas! I know her. Oh, begone!  
Why is that tainted bosom bare?  
Why fix on me that eye of stone?  
Why have they left us thus alone?”

The records of crime, also, are full of instances showing how, in dreams, the guilty bosom has been forced to betray its secrets, and how the wretched culprit has had to battle with the accusing angels to the very dawning of the day.

But, as our favorite old author has said, that—

“Dreams be significations  
As well of joy as of tribulations,  
That folks endure in this life present:  
There nedeth to make of this none argument.”

Ah, yes, often when the mind has been vexed with care, men have been permitted not simply to find rest in sleep, but good cheer in the thoughts which have come to them in their night visions! As our familiar speech happily expresses it, they *lose* themselves, and while thus insensible to all the outward and actual circumstances of their being, they are made to pass through mental experiences, the very memories of which can never be forgotten. Then, the

prisoner, escaping from his narrow cell, breathes again the air of freedom. The sick man, leaving his weary pillow, wanders forth amid scenes to which his wasted limbs will never carry him. The exile re-visits his native land, and revels amid the dear associates of former years. Mourners dry their tears, and once more embrace the loved and the lost, and the troubled spirit, whatever the source of its disquietude, casts off its oppressive burden, and is enabled to rise into brighter realms, and, through ideal creations, to hail the encouraging presages of a better future!

May we not suggest, also, that in our dreams there is a pleasing intimation of the soul's immortality? It would not be wise, of course,—and, happily, it is not necessary,—to rely on any such intimations in proof of this great doctrine. But, at the same time, the very fact that the spirit is known to be capable of exertion, while the physical senses are in a state of suspension, may teach us, at least, this much; that its manifestations are, in a great measure, independent of its corporeal relations. And if this be so, then, in the activity of the mind while our weary frames rest in their beds, we may discover something like a pledge of its higher exertions, when, at last, our bodies shall sleep in their graves.

The proper *self-hood* of man is undoubtedly the soul. No farther proof can be needed of this than the admitted fact, that the sensations of which we are now conscious, as coming purely through bodily impressions, are wholly indebted to the immaterial principle of our nature for their manifestation. That the soul, on the other hand, is capable of receiving impressions, and exercising its faculties independent of its relations to the body, is sufficiently evident, from what has already been said respecting its marvellous workings without the use of the senses, and, so far as we can discover, in the absence of all extraneous influence.

A striking illustration of this position is suggested in the history of the apostle Paul. So marvellous on one occasion, he tells us, were his perceptions, and so extraordinary his sensations, that, while insensible of any connexion with a material body, he was *caught up* into the third heaven, and

there, in unutterable words, received a superabundance of revelations. Now if under these extraordinary circumstances, such an experience be possible, the question arises, what ground have we for doubting the ability of the mind under other and ordinary modes (as in dreaming) to enter into a state essentially separate from all known physical relations.

In the language of another,\*

"If it may do this in cases where after all the body is revived, the soul appearing to come back to it after an absence, the presumption rises almost to certainty that it may do the same thing when the body is finally and beyond recall dissolved ;—that after the soul has been altogether released and dislodged from this mortal frame, it may still retain and employ its powers, finding room for their future and swifter advancement, and matching them with more august companions and more glorious circumstances, in a future state of being! I see no way of evading this conclusion. And I see not how any man, conscious of the dignity and the permanence of his powers, should desire to evade it."

For ourselves, we cheerfully acknowledge this truth, and believing it possible for the spirit to escape, for a time, from its present habitation, we regard the fact as furnishing the substantial basis for a constructive argument in favor not simply of the *future*, but of the *unlimited* duration of the soul's existence! Much more might be said on this interesting subject, but it is time, perhaps, to bring our article to a close. We will only add, then, that in presenting these views of dreams, it has been with no confident hope of explaining all their mysteries, nor has it been our object to restore dream-land to the rank it once held among the kingdoms of the mind. On the contrary, we have simply sought to separate it from the realm of divination, and to bring it, as far as possible, within the region of philosophy and religion. If, then, we have been to any extent successful in our purpose, the results reached are sufficient to show that the strange phenomena connected with this state are generally capable of a higher improvement than we are wont to make of them, and that henceforth, among all our other means of instruction, warning and blessing, must be reckoned DREAMS!

---

\*Richard S. Storrs, Jr., D. D., *Constitution of Human Soul*, page 321.

## ART. VIII.—NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

**LIFE PICTURES**; From a Pastor's Note Book. By ROBERT TURNBULL, author of "Christ in History," the "Genius of Scotland," &c. (New-York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co.; Boston: Gould & Lincoln; Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1857. One volume, 16mo., pp. 342.)

This book is a group of "Life Pictures" of the practical influence of Christian truth, culled, not altogether at random, from a "Pastor's Note Book." They seem to be in a carefully arranged series, beginning with the first approaches of the truth in the Gospel as a wooing friend to an opposing and finally rejecting mind; each succeeding picture exhibiting an advance in its subduing influence, and a new glory in its conquest, until we have passed from the skeptic unconvinced, to the glorified believer in the most entrancing hour of the influence of practical Christianity, seen in the rapture of the spirit just wedded in death to Christ, revelling in the land of Beulah. A passing glance at these pictures in their order, will exhibit the scope and aim of the volume.

In Frank Wilson, the leading picture, occupying one-fourth of the volume, we have a youth of genius filled with a college student's doubts and questionings as to God and immortality. Some might think the Pastor's discussions with Frank savor too much of dialectics; but no one accustomed to meet the varying and subtle hues of atheistic suggestion among studious youth would so judge. Frank is at last moved and subdued, not by his metaphysics, but simply by his being directed to the *Sacred Scriptures* when his metaphysics failed to satisfy him.

The second picture, called "The Lost," is a striking illustration of the powerlessness of argument to reach a mind thoroughly in love with skepticism. The youthful subject of that skepticism writes to his pastor of his difficulties; among other things he urges that one's belief is an *involuntary* thing, for which, of course, he is not responsible, and that each man's own reason, thus compelled and involuntary in its suggestions, must be each man's guide to truth even in judging of the meaning of the New Testament. He says on this point, that the book loaned him by the Pastor on "The Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation" seemed unsatisfactory; since the author presented an assumed hypothesis of his own as to the philosophy of the Old Testament; an hypothesis which might satisfy one mind, while it did not command the belief of another mind. Some passages of the Pastor's reply to these suggestions, and to this particular illustration of the skeptic's view, are worthy of special note by those who meet young men cherishing this class of skeptical notions.

While the first sketch presents to us skepticism in its nature, the second, entitled "Lost," and the third, called "Found," seem to present in contrast the two results which may follow the skeptic's suggestion. A letter from E. C.,—the subject of the third sketch—to the Pastor forms this entire Picture. A young man who determined to be a skeptic, took Abner Kneeland's paper to strengthen his purpose; but after some time was brought under the Pastor's ministrations, and was pressed to settle the question, "Is there a God? If so, what is our relation to him? and, what is the *rule* of our duty to him, if the Scriptures be not?" By a series of providences he was led first to be an assistant in preparing a religious paper (*The Hartford Christian Secretary*), and finally at his father's death to take the entire charge of it. The reading of selections for publication had this effect on his mind:

"Every now and then some new phase of thought, some new aspect of religious doctrine and argument would strike my mind, and almost unconsciously to myself, I found pin after pin of my infidel structure falling out, stone after stone of my foundation caving in."

The fourth sketch, "The Baker Boy," brings back the days following Whitefield's labors, and presents an instance of street preaching on Boston Common in 1790. The conviction produced by a sermon of a Methodist preacher under the old elm tree, led the baker's boy to Dr. Stillman's (the Baptist) Church. The baker's boy proves to be William Bentley, well known as "Father Bentley" throughout New-England, and even over our whole country; the spiritual father of feeble Baptist Churches, then just beginning in Massachusetts and Connecticut in towns where now three, four, and even more flourishing churches are gathered. Many at the South, as well as in the North, will remember the sweet spirit that used to breathe from "Father Bentley's holy tone" in the missionary gatherings from all parts of the land.

The fifth, entitled "The Divine Life," is the brief memoir of a sprightly, somewhat frivolous girl, truly converted and perfectly transformed in the great ends of her existence. The sixth, entitled "The Consecration," is a series of letters from a young man named Edward, in which the struggles of a young mind peculiarly ambitious of literary distinction, drawn first while under college influence, to give up worldly pleasure for faith in Christ, and then led on through the profession of law to the humbler sphere of the gospel ministry are pictured; till soon after he has made his consecration, Edward is called to a higher sphere of spiritual life and exaltation. The seventh, called "The Struggle and Triumph," is a sketch of one who believed that at ten years of age he was converted, but who in subsequent years was led to reject this experience as simply the effect of education, and the pressure of circumstances upon childish susceptibilities. Says the Pastor, "He had asked more than once to have his connection with the church dissolved; but he appeared so earnest, and even conscientious, that his request was kindly but firmly declined, in the hope that the eclipse of his faith might pass away." This hope was realized, and he subsequently regarded his conversion in childhood as genuine. Here is pictured the experience of perhaps two-thirds of the members of a *spiritual* church of Christ; *growing* and of course showing the *steps* of growth. The church was *meant* for such; its work is to *edify*, to build up the body. To cut such off, would argue but a guilty slothfulness, which was unwilling to do the work of *Christ* for such spirits. Led *through* this valley of doubt, they are the pillars of the church built on the foundation of the Apostles, and of Christ, the chief corner stone; for they are *sinners saved*.

The eighth picture is of that good, though somewhat eccentric man, Rev. Harvey Miller, late pastor of the Baptist church in Meriden, Conn. No pastor can read a paragraph of the memoir without reading all; and some lineament caught from his cheerful piety will be likely to give a new shade of meaning to the title of the sketch, "Holy Living and Dying." Sandy Morrison, the ninth picture, is that of a plain, richly Bible-read Scotchman, whose strong sense and deep experience alike find utterance in his reply to the skeptical suggestion which perverts Solomon's words, "Time and *chance* happen to all." "Hoot toot, man," Sandy would reply, "that only means that time and *opportunity* happen to all; and sure I am sic a thing as that happens only by the *grace o' God*."

In the remaining five sketches, making fourteen in all, we had marked passages of special interest, particularly in the melancholy but sweet narrative of Daniel E. J. Glazier, an aspiring youth, converted in college

after a fierce struggle between conscience and ambition, deciding for the law by a compromise between the same two struggling voices within him; but finally a student in the theological seminary, loved and useful as a preacher even while there, but falling a prey to his aspiring nature just on the threshold of his work.

In their combined form, this volume of Dr. Turnbull's sketches must prove a rich cluster of gems for many a reader. They are worthy some day—like Cecil's and Hannah More's similar treatises—to appear in separate tracts, each one of which a judicious and earnest pastor could put in the hands of those in his flock for whom they were specially adapted. Such pictures *live*, like the Dairyman's Daughter and the Shepherd of Salisbury, for like the stories of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, they are the only pictures of an age worth preserving. God will keep alive such narratives, and man will not let them die.

**PULPIT ELOQUENCE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY**; being Supplementary to the History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence, Deceased Divines, and containing Discourses of Eminent Living Ministers, in Europe and America, with Sketches Biographical and Descriptive. By Rev. HENRY C. FISH. With an Introductory Essay by EDWARDS A. PARK, D.D., Abbott Professor of Andover Theological Seminary. (New-York: M. W. Dodd. Royal 8vo., pp. 815.)

Mr. Fish has laid the religious community under great obligations by his noble volumes of "The History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence," previously published, and by the work before us,—a worthy supplement to them. It contains fifty-eight sermons—"master-pieces"—by many of the most eminent "evangelical" ministers of the age, with a brief biographical and descriptive sketch of each—and a very valuable introductory essay, on "The Preacher's Influence," by Professor Park, himself one of the ablest and most eloquent of living divines. It is embellished with beautiful steel engravings of D'Aubigne, Tholuck, Wm. R. Williams, Henry Melville, Thomas Guthrie, Henry Cooke, and William Roberts. The German pulpit has nine representatives here, the French, English and Scotch, eight each, the Irish four, the Welsh three, and the American eighteen. The selection of so few from the many aspirants to distinction was a difficult task, but we think it has been very successfully performed. They are principally men whose reputation is as wide as the limits of Christendom. The names of Gaussen, Monod, Barnes, Beecher, Bethune, Nott, Fuller, Wayland, Durbin, James, Noel, Bunting, Spurgeon, Duff, Cumming, Hamilton and Whately, as well as of others in this volume, will be acknowledged everywhere worthy to stand as representatives of the "Pulpit Eloquence of the Nineteenth Century." A few of the discourses have for years had a wide circulation in other forms, which we rather regret as detracting from the *freshness* of the work, but as they were specially *designated* by their authors, we will not complain. The others were never before published, and the admirably executed translations—prepared expressly for these pages—compose one-third of the number.

The sketches, based—as we are assured—upon authentic information, are interesting and valuable, giving in brief compass the main facts in each biography, with a description of the preacher's personal appearance, and an estimate of his intellectual and social character. Their author deals almost too much in *superlatives*, and frequently lays too flattering a tribute of eulogy at the feet of these living "most eloquent pulpit orators," which neither comports with our views of good taste, nor can possibly be grateful to the "piety, modesty and humility" which he ascribes to some of them. The volume as a whole, however, is worthy of a place in the library of every preacher, and of every Christian who can appreciate the charms of sacred eloquence.

SERMONS ON SPECIAL OCCASIONS. By JOHN HARRIS, D. D., late President of New College, London; author of the "Great Teacher," the "Great Commission," "Pre-Adamite Earth," etc., etc. First Series. (Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 12mo., pp. 363.)

This is the first volume of "the posthumous works" of Dr. Harris,—edited by Rev. Philip Smith, B. A., formerly a colleague of the author—to be issued by the same publishers, in four volumes, and accompanied with a memoir, uniform with the works. They could hardly perform a more grateful service for the religious public, than to give to the world *all* the writings of that distinguished man. Since his first appearance as an author, in "The Great Teacher," and "Mammon," more than twenty years ago, till his lamented death, his literary career has been a continued triumph; and whether as the repeatedly successful "prize essayist," the eloquent preacher, or the profound theologian, he has won for himself a name not unworthy to rank with Edwards, Foster, Hall and Chalmers. His works are among the richest treasures of Christendom. In his youthful productions imagination and fancy greatly predominate, and we could almost wish they were less rich in sparkling figures; but in his later years he has shown himself able to grapple with the most sublime and difficult themes, to illuminate them with the clear light of his intellect, to illustrate them with the copious resources of his learning, and to exhibit them with an affluence and beauty of diction rarely equalled.

Most of the discourses before us are evidently the fruit of his maturer years. Profound without obscurity, brilliant without gaudiness, learned without pedantry, they seem to us among the best specimens of sermons in the English language. Especially is this true of those entitled "The Gospel the Power of God unto Salvation;" "The Field and Harvest of Christian Labor;" and "Christ weeping over Jerusalem." They abound in original thoughts, impressive illustrations, practical suggestions, and thrilling appeals. They are eminently *suggestive*, kindling in the reader's mind valuable trains of reflection, and frequently condensing into a single page, or even sentence, thoughts enough to make a volume, if expanded. Their chief glory, however, consists in the fact that from first to last they are full of CHRIST. All the attainments and powers of the preacher are consecrated to the one object of setting "a diadem" of glory on the "brow of Messiah." From Him he draws every motive and encouragement, to Him he points every hope, on Him he finds every doctrine in Him he finds "the key to the creation of the universe." As examples of the true way to preach "Christ crucified" we commend these sermons to the careful study of every minister.

We regret that we are obliged in any respect to qualify our praise of these discourses. But in the sermon on "The Union of the Church for the Conversion of the World," there is a vagueness about his definition of the kind of union he advocates, which sheds confusion over the whole discourse, and leads the preacher most unworthily to attack the distinction—commonly made by Baptists—between *Christian* and *ecclesiastical* fellowship as "absurd and hypocritical," and to denounce a church which declines partaking of the LORD'S SUPPER with other churches, as "obviously opposing the will of God." The Baptists who practice "close communion" do it only because it seems to them demanded by that Book which Dr. Harris himself upholds as of "supreme authority;" and their active co-operation in Christian enterprises with their brethren of other names, proves that the distinction they make between the two kinds of fellowship is neither "absurd nor hypocritical."

"LECTURES ON TEMPERANCE." By ELIPHALET NOTT, D. D., LL. D., President of Union College, with an Introduction by TAYLER LEWIS, LL. D.,

Professor in Union College. Edited by AMASA M'Coy, late Editor of the *Prohibitionist*. (12mo., pp. 341. Published by Sheldon, Blakeman & Co., 115 Nassau Street; Gould & Lincoln, Boston; S. C. Griggs & Co. Chicago.)

The high commendation which has been bestowed on these lectures, as "the *book of books* on Temperance," appears to us—after a careful examination of the volume,—well deserved. In no other of the very numerous publications on that subject have we found combined so much solid argument, such extensive Scriptural and classical research, such profound deference to the Bible as the guide of man, such Christian charity for liquor venders and drinkers, such fairness to opposers, such caution and candor in taking positions, and such lucid, chaste, and convincing eloquence in defending them. Dr. Nott is an earnest advocate of *Total Abstinence*, and his arguments and appeals are addressed not so much to the drunkard, as to the "reputable, moderate, Christian wine drinker." He finds them upon "the GREAT DISCOVERY that drunkenness is caused by drinking; moderate, temperate, continuous drinking, and that entire sobriety can be restored and maintained by ABSTINENCE." The terrible individual, social and national evils of drunkenness—the acknowledged power of example and influence, and the voice of God in Nature and Revelation are all brought to bear with immense force in sustaining this position, and destroying the specious pleas by which moderate drinking has been defended.

One of the chief excellences of the book is its thorough examination of the objection urged against *total* abstinence, from the commendatory manner in which *wine* is frequently mentioned in the Scriptures. That this is a serious difficulty to many pious and intelligent persons, and one of the most formidable obstacles to the perfect triumph of Temperance in the Christian Church, and consequently in the world, we are fully convinced.

From a careful comparison of the passages in which *wine* is mentioned, Dr. Nott shows that *seven* different words were used by prophets and patriarchs, which are for the most part wrenchingly translated in the English version by one word—*wine*. That the "fruit of the vine" in its natural, *unfermented* state, "the wine of the vineyard, the cluster, the press and the vat"—was "accounted by the sacred writers a better article" than fermented, intoxicating wine; that the *former*—"mild, innocent, unin-toxicating"—was commended by the Scriptures, and the latter condemned as "a mocker," the source of woe and sorrow, and the emblem of Divine wrath.

This position is confirmed by copious citations from classic authors, and furnishes a solution of the seeming inconsistency of the Scriptures, in sometimes denouncing as a curse the very beverage they elsewhere pronounce a good gift of God.

In addition to Dr. Nott's lectures, the volume contains an able Introduction by Professor Lewis, a letter from E. C. Delavan to Governor King, showing the gratifying progress of the Temperance Cause within the last thirty years; an Address by Bishop Potter, of Pennsylvania, on "The Drinking Usages of Society," and a short article on "The Use and Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors in Health and Disease," by Dr. Wm. B. Carpenter. We bespeak for it a wide circulation. Let ministers study and re-produce for their own people its examination of the Scriptural view of "the wine question;" let the friends of humanity scatter it broadcast through the land—and let the churches everywhere, like the Jews at the paschal feast—"refuse the use of *fermented* wine in the cup of blessing which they bless," and thus remove one of the greatest stumbling blocks to the progress of the noblest reform of the age.

THE CITY; Its Sins and Sorrows. Being a Series of Sermons from Luke xix: 41, by THOMAS GUTHRIE, D. D., author of "The Gospel in Ez-

ekiel," &c. (New-York: Robert Carter and Brothers. 16mo., pp. 215.)

The four great evils of all cities—Licentiousness, Drunkenness, Ignorance and Irreligion, are assailed in these sermons by no ordinary foe. Dr. Guthrie is unsurpassed by any living religious writer in power over the popular mind. His wonderful *descriptive* talent, his frequent use of the most beautiful and striking illustrations and anecdotes, drawn from nature, art and history; his style, at once clear, vigorous and natural, yet so interwoven with figures and pictures as to remind one of the richest embroidery—where flowers of every hue and threads of gold are cunningly intermingled—all tend to invest his productions with far more than common attractions. Having been at one time himself a city missionary, he speaks in this volume from experience of the "sins and sorrows" of city life. Never have we seen them portrayed in more glowing colors, and though Edinburgh principally furnishes the scenes described, yet, doubtless, all the large cities, even of our own happy land, can furnish abundant parallels. The orator,—not content with pointing out the evils,—details effective plans for their removal. He dwells with special emphasis on total abstinence and proper legislative enactments as the cure of drunkenness, and upon *lay preaching* and individual Christian activity as a means of purifying the immoral and degraded classes of society. We are gratified at the honorable mention he makes in this connection, of the labors of our own Oncken and the German Baptist churches.

An appendix of about fifty pages contains some most appalling and other very cheering statistics. It is emphatically a book for the times.

**A MANUAL OF THEOLOGY.** By J. L. DAGG, D.D. (Charleston: Southern Baptist Publication Society. 8vo., pp. 379. 1857.)

The want has long been felt of a manual of theology adapted to the instruction of that large and rapidly increasing class—lay preachers, Sabbath school teachers, colporteurs, young ministers who are thrust into the work without time or means for more extensive study, in short, intelligent Christians who have neither the time nor taste for protracted investigation. This book seems to us—after a careful examination—better suited to supply this want than any other we are acquainted with. While, doubtless, on some minor points many pious theologians may differ from Dr. Dagg, yet he has here given in brief compass, a solid, Scriptural, and able vindication of those doctrines dear to millions of Christian hearts—"the doctrines of grace." His theology—while calling no man master, and relying on God's Word alone for proof—is decidedly Calvinistic. The existence, perfections and providence of God, and the great truths of human depravity, and Divine sovereignty in the election, redemption, calling, sanctification and salvation of his people, by God—the Father, Son and Holy Spirit,—are forcibly set forth and defended against objectors. He has not attempted in the least to give a history of doctrines, or to fortify his views by a single quotation from human authority. His appeal is to the Bible, and the necessary brevity of his work has prevented him from noticing at length all the texts relied upon, or giving a thorough criticism of disputed texts. They are in great measure only referred to, and the results of careful study are laid before the reader, instead of a parade of the author's learning. The style is clear, unadorned, and yet not dry, but even at times eloquent. A spirit of humble submission to God's declarations pervades the work, and, unlike most treatises on theology, it is devotional and practical, as well as doctrinal. We regret that brief discussions of the Sabbath, and of the Church and Ordinances, are not included in this volume, so that it might have been complete, as a manual to put into the hands of the student and the inquirer.

It is handsomely printed, though we noticed several typographical errors, which we hope will be corrected in subsequent editions.

AN ANALYTICAL CONCORDANCE TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES: Edited by JOHN EADIE, D. D., LL. D., &c., &c. (Boston: Gould & Lincoln; New-York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co.; Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard. 1857.)

Webster defines a *Concordance* to be—"A dictionary or index, in which all the principal words used in the Scriptures are arranged alphabetically, and the book, chapter and verse in which each word occurs are noted;—designed to assist an inquirer in finding any passage of Scripture by means of any leading word in a verse which he can recollect." This definition being correct, the term *Concordance*, even with the explicative "Analytical," does not rightly describe the present work, whose character and object are quite different from those of a Concordance, and yet, perhaps, that term is as good as any in existence. We prefer to allow the original and the American Editor to describe this work. The former says this volume "is an attempt so to classify Scripture under separate heads as to exhaust its contents. The reader will find under the respective articles or sections what the Bible says on the separate subjects, in relation to doctrine, ethics and antiquities. \* \* \* \* \* The work is simply Scripture printed under classified heads. Thus to take the first article, AGRICULTURE, the reader will ascertain under it what is said in Scripture as to the lands and farms of Canaan, the processes of husbandry, such as plowing, sowing and reaping, &c., and the allusions to them contained in the prophets, and in the parables of our Lord, with much more of similar import. \* \* \* Many verses are repeated twice, thrice, or oftener, under different heads, the only limit being the fear of too large a volume." The Editor vouches for the accuracy of the references, which have been, he declares, verified by young eyes, and carefully prepared by young fingers, in the retirement of a rural manse. "The work is farther enriched by a full Index, \* \* \* \* \* and by a Synopsis \* \* exhibiting a bird's eye view of Biblical Antiquities and Theology." The author frankly acknowledges his work to be both based upon, and suggested by that of Talbott, which was printed in London in the year 1800; while he convicts West as having plagiarized the same.

The American Editor characterizes the work as a "Concordance of Subjects," so that it differs from, and does not supersede the *common* Concordance. It also differs from the Topical Text-Book, in that the latter contains but a part; the other the whole of the Bible.

We are glad, though late, to add our testimony to the value and excellency of this work. As promotive of the study and the understanding of Bible truth, we warmly commend it; adding the caution, that neither this nor other works, however made from and like the Bible, be allowed, in any degree, to supersede resort to the Bible itself, in all its Divine unity. The mechanical execution is in the best style of Gould & Lincoln.

BIBLICAL COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Dr. HERMANN OLSHAUSEN. Translated from the German, and revised by A. C. KENDRICK, D.D. Volumes I. II. III. IV. (New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Philadelphia, American Baptist Publication Society. 1857.)

The first of these volumes has already been noticed in the Christian Review (see vol. xxi. p. 628.) Four volumes have now appeared, and have met with great commendation from almost the entire religious press of this country, as a discriminating and profound, yet clear and instructive exposition of the sacred text. The IV. volume begins with that important chapter, the seventh of Romans, and concludes with the sixth of Galatians. The editor, in the preface, states that "the widely extended favor and interest with which the work has been received, has prompted the editor to augmented pains in securing to the American edition accuracy, clearness, and even a degree of elegance. The amount of labor which this has involved will be appreciated only by those who have gone

through a similar task." A future number of the Review will, we hope, contain an extended notice of this important Commentary.

**THE PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA.** A condensed translation from Herzog's "Real Encyclopedia," with additions. By Rev. J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D. Part V. (Lindsay & Blakiston, Publishers, Philadelphia.)

While we cannot as Baptists endorse all the sentiments hitherto advocated in this Encyclopedia, we must accord to it the merit of great ability and varied learning. Part V. contains among numerous other things, articles on Calvin, the Canon of the Old and New Testaments, Catholicism, and Thomas Chalmers.

"**THE DIVINE LIFE**; a Book of Facts and Histories, showing the Manifold Workings of the Holy Spirit." By the Rev. JOHN KENNEDY, F.R. G.S. (12mo., pp. 375. Parry & M'Millan, Philadelphia.)

This is a piece of *mosaic*, comprising an immense number of quotations from various eminent writers, and abstracts of numerous biographical sketches, illustrating the truth that "there are diversities of operations, but *one Spirit*" in the conversion of souls to God. The author is a firm believer in "the doctrines of grace," and while his book has no marks of genius or of originality, it is valuable as an evidence of the power and essential oneness of genuine religion in its diversified manifestations, amid all the varieties of human condition, character and culture.

"**EVENINGS WITH JESUS**; a Series of Devotional Readings for the Closet and the Family." Carefully prepared from Notes of Sermons preached by the late Rev. WILLIAM JAY, of Bath. (12mo., pp. 510. Published by Parry & M'Millan, Philadelphia.)

The name of WILLIAM JAY is enough to ensure a welcome from many a pious heart to everything from his pen. His "Morning and Evening Exercises" have long been a cherished companion for the closet, aiding the meditations and devotions of God's people. The present volume, though not—in our judgment—quite equal to the above named work, still abounds in those sententious observations, those deeply spiritual reflections, those clear glances into the hidden meaning of the Scriptures, and those shrewd practical inferences which have rendered his former works so precious. No Christian can use it daily without finding his mind quickened and his heart warmed.

**THE LIFE OF JAMES MONTGOMERY.** By Mrs. H. C. KNIGHT, Authoress of "Lady Huntington and her Friends." &c., &c. (Gould & Lincoln, Boston. 12mo., pp. 416.)

The quiet life of a Christian Poet can hardly be expected to furnish many exciting incidents; but all who have read or sung with heart-felt emotion the poems or hymns of the "Cowper of the nineteenth century," will be interested in tracing here the hidden sources of that heavenly light which shed its glow over every line of Montgomery. Mrs. Knight has with much taste and skill compressed into one volume the valuable materials scattered through the seven volumes of the London edition of his memoirs. She has allowed the Poet himself to unfold his own character, opinions and feelings,—his *heart history*—principally by "letters, and paragraphs from letters," (he never kept a diary,) with just enough of narrative by her own hand to keep up the biographical connection of the various events of his life. "Editor and author,—an active citizen, a judicious friend to the poor, an earnest co-laborer in many of the beneficial enterprises of the day," profoundly interested in all the onward movements of the time, and promoting not only by his pen, but by his voice, his counsel, his money and his influence, the cause of Christ and of humanity, he lived to the good old age of 83, a noble and beautiful example of sanctified genius. We welcome this "Life" as a precious

contribution to the treasures of Christian biography. We are promised a more extended "review" of it for a future number, by one who has already taken high rank among our own Christian poets.

**ESSAYS IN BIOGRAPHY AND CRITICISM.** By PETER BAYNE, M.A., Author of "The Christian Life, Social and Individual." First Series. (Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 12mo., pp. 426.)

The subjects of these Essays are: Thomas De Quincey and his Works.—Tennyson and his Teachers.—Mrs. Barrett Browning.—Glimpses of Recent British Art.—Ruskin and his Critics.—Hugh Miller.—The Modern Novel (Dickens, Bulwer, Thackeray,).—Ellis, Acton, and Currer Bell.

The author is already very favorably known by his former work—"The Christian Life"—and by his recent appointment as Hugh Miller's successor to the Editorship of the Edinburgh "Witness." He has rare talent as a critic and essay writer. Thoroughly conversant with both ancient and modern literature, an independent thinker, with an eye and a heart for real beauty and truth, whether in literature, art or nature, and master of a glowing style, profusely adorned with vivid and picturesque imagery, it is not surprising that he has already attained great popularity. It is to us highly gratifying that so able a writer is a decided Christian, and views every question from a Christian "stand-point." The essays before us abound in just views of society, of distinguished authors, artists, and their works, expressed in his own attractive manner. He does not belong to the "*Nil Admirari*" school, but praises with hearty good will where he thinks it deserved, and condemns with equally honest indignation departures from truth and virtue, even in the lives and writings of earth's greatest men. While, of course, we cannot assent to every position taken, or every criticism made by the author, we deem the volume in the main a very valuable collection of "miscellanies." We shall look with interest for the "Second Series."

**THE MARTYR OF THE PONGAS.** Being a memoir of the Rev. Hamble James Leacock, leader of the West Indian Mission to Western Africa. By the Rev. HENRY CASWALL, D.D., Vicar of Figheldean, Wilts, Author of "America and the American Church," etc., etc., and English Secretary to the West Indian Church Association for the furtherance of the Gospel in Western Africa. (New-York: T. N. Stanford, 637 Broadway. 12mo., pp. 281.)

The subject of this memoir was doubtless a pious man, and an earnest and faithful preacher in the Episcopal Church, but we cannot learn from the *facts* given by his biographer,—apart from the glowing eulogies dictated by personal friendship,—that he was at all more "remarkable" than thousands of other good men. He evidently had a roving disposition, having been connected as pastor, or as a temporary supply, with no less than eleven different parishes during his ministry of thirty years. He offered himself when more than *sixty* years of age as a missionary for Africa, an offer which was accepted,—as we think, most injudiciously, dooming him as it did to certain and speedy death. His brief missionary labors of five months, however, were highly blessed by Providence, so that they were not utterly in vain. The memoir, though not long, is unnecessarily spun out by a considerable display of egotism on the part of the writer, and by the introduction of numerous minute and uninteresting details and sketches of other persons. The author makes no secret of his "Churchmanship," as his numerous allusions to "separatists" and "sectarian bodies," "the regular line of apostolical descent," &c., abundantly evince. He also favors us with the gratifying information that "at present there is *no part of the United States without its bishop!*"

LIVES OF THE QUEENS OF SCOTLAND AND ENGLISH PRINCESSES CONNECTED WITH THE REGAL SUCCESSION OF GREAT BRITAIN. By AGNES STRICKLAND, author of "The Lives of the Queens of England." Volume Sixth. (12mo., pp. 365. New-York: Harper & Brothers.)

LIFE OF MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS. In Two Books. By DONALD MCLEOD. Author of Pynnshurst, Bloodstone, Life of Walter Scott, &c. (12mo., pp. 427. Charles Scribner, New-York.)

Both these volumes relate to the same unfortunate queen. That of Agnes Strickland is a continuation of her history from a previous volume, commencing with her forced abdication of the crown during her imprisonment at Lochleven, and ending with an account of her contract of marriage with the Duke of Norfolk, while she was imprisoned in England. It descends into the minutest details, omitting nothing which can throw light on the character, occupations or misfortunes of the royal victim; and will doubtless be—when finished—the most complete life of Mary yet published, and a thorough vindication of her character from the many foul stains which not only her persecutors, but even historians like Hume and Robertson have cast upon it. The fair biographer sympathizes deeply with the hapless queen, and enters into her defense with all a woman's warmth of nature, and yet with rare tact and skill in sifting the testimony against her, and unravelling the intricate meshes of the vile plot which was woven for her destruction. Without —like Mr. McLeod—pronouncing her "as gentle and stainless a lady as God ever made," she maintains her perfect innocence of Darnly's murder, or of the least shade of guilt with Bothwell,—her *forced* marriage with whom was a part of the plot of her enemies.

Mr. McLeod's work was evidently written under strong feeling. He enters the lists as Mary's champion with the zeal of a knight-errant, charges upon her foes with all the power that stubborn facts and abusive epithets can impart, and if he does not succeed in proving her to have been an angel in disguise, he does awaken the sympathy of his readers, interest them in the most thrilling story to be found in all history, and fill them with pity for the lovely queen and indignation for her oppressors. With the new light thrown upon those "troublous times" by the recent discovery of "nearly five hundred letters and State papers," which are constantly quoted and referred to by both these writers, we confess ourselves converts to the conviction, that "never was any princess more successfully *be-lied* than Mary Stuart," and that her great crimes consisted in being a *queen*, a *beauty*, a *Romanist*, and the heir of England's throne. These were the causes of the persecution she met with in life, and of the consequent defamation which has pursued her for three centuries after her death. Mr. McLeod errs, we think, in not making sufficient allowance for the spirit of the times in which she lived, or for the strong pressure of political *necessity* which impelled the English Government to their base treatment of Mary. He is far too severe on John Knox and the Protestant leaders generally, and too lenient to the bigotry and cruelty of the Romanists.

THE HISTORY OF KING PHILIP. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT. (New York, Harper & Bros. 1857. 18mo., pp 410.)

Few histories contain more of romantic and thrilling adventure than that of our Pilgrim Fathers. Mr. Abbott has selected that portion which abounds more than any other with scenes of the deepest tragedy. The bloody conflicts, the midnight conflagrations, the treacherous plots and ambushes, the terrible sufferings and fearful tortures which attended the desperate struggle of the most warlike and powerful Indian chief with the usurping English, and his final overthrow, are all vividly depicted in these pages. The author professes to have gathered his materials with great labor, and "has spared no pains in the endeavor to be accurate."

While not intended *exclusively* for the young, yet the style is so simple that it may be read by them with pleasure.

GEORGE WHITEFIELD. A Biography, with special reference to his labors in America. Compiled by JOSEPH BELCHER, D.D., author of the life of Rev. Dr. Carey, etc. (American Tract Society, New York. 12mo, pp. 514.)

This is the best biography we have ever seen of the "most distinguished uninspired preacher, perhaps, of any age or country." Those who know Dr. Belcher will need only his assurance that "he has devoted no small labor to gather from every source to which he could gain access, whatever appeared to him important to be known respecting" Whitefield, to feel satisfied that the work is faithfully executed. It dwells especially on his Herculean labors in America, and relates many new incidents of his wonderful career. A perusal of this volume must tend to kindle fresh zeal in the hearts of God's ministers, and to inspire in every Christian more fervent prayer that the Lord of the harvest will send forth many such *laborers* into his *harvest*.

THE POOR BOY AND MERCHANT PRINCE; or, Elements of Success drawn from the Life and Character of the late Amos Lawrence. A Book for Youth. By WILLIAM M. THAYER, Author of "The Morning Star," "Life at the Fireside," etc. (Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 16mo., pp. 349. 1857.)

The distinguished merchant and benevolent man, Amos Lawrence, is the central figure in this book, but the writer has grouped around him many others,—"preachers, philosophers, statesmen, merchants and mechanics,"—all testifying by example, as well as precept, that industry, frugality, punctuality, system, earnestness, perseverance, integrity, politeness, benevolence, and, above all, *religion*, are among the indispensable elements of true success in life. The lessons it teaches are very important in this "fast" age, this age of wild speculations, extravagant expenditure, and fashionable fraud. It is a capital book not only for boys, but young men, for it will prove not only attractive, but serviceable, in moulding their principles, and guiding them into the paths of virtue, competence and usefulness.

THE NORTHWEST COAST; or, Three Years' Residence in Washington Territory. By JAMES G. SWAN. (With numerous Illustrations. pp. 429. 12mo. Harper & Brothers.)

From personal observation of the country and people described in this volume, the author has been enabled to give an interesting description of the geography, climate and productions of that portion of our Northwest Coast lying between the Straits of Fuca and the Columbia River. His account of the various tribes of Indians, their customs, superstitions, religion and languages, is quite minute, and interspersed with numerous anecdotes illustrating their character and condition, which are certainly bad enough to awaken pity in every Christian heart. We think, however, our author has ventured entirely beyond his depth when he attempts—on several occasions—to give his views of the right method and the prospects of *missionary labor* among them; especially as he has so little reverence for the Bible as to prefer the crude and rash statements of *Nott* and *Gliddon!* to those of *Moses*, as to the origin and antiquity of the human race, and the confusion of tongues at Babel. See pages 193, 206—7, 312—13.

VIRGINIA ILLUSTRATED. Containing a Visit to the Virginian Canaan, and the Adventures of Porte Crayon and his Cousins." Illustrated from Drawings. By PORTE CRAYON. (8vo., pp. 300. Harper & Brothers.)

There are few portions of our country containing such beautiful, grand and strange scenery, and such numerous and wonderful medicinal

springs, as the mountainous region of Western Virginia. This volume—which originally appeared in the monthly numbers of Harper's Magazine—presents the most graphic pictures of that scenery we have ever seen. It professes to record the adventures of "Porte Crayon" and three merry young ladies on an autumnal pleasure trip through that romantic region, and the well drawn descriptions of its natural wonders are enlivened by the jests and stories of the gay party. The chief value of the book, however, is in its *illustrations*. These are one hundred and thirty eight in number, and are remarkably truthful and beautiful, especially those of Weyer's Cave, the Natural Bridge, and the various Springs. We can testify—from our own observation—to their accuracy, and unhesitatingly pronounce this book one of the most beautiful—of its kind—ever issued by the American Press.

**BOAT LIFE IN EGYPT AND NUBIA.** By Wm. C. PRIME. Author of "Tent Life in the Holy Land," "The Old House by the River," &c. (12mo., pp. 498. New-York: Harper & Brothers.)

This very appropriate title gives no promise of a volume on Egyptian *antiquities*, but rather of what it really is—a lively sketch of "incidents of travel," and "personal adventures" on the Nile, accompanied with just enough description of the people, and the scenery, the grand old ruins and marvellous tombs of Egypt, to render it instructive as well as amusing. The author evidently had "a jolly time," with his friend Trumbull, and their two wives, "Miriam and Amy," and after his description of the comforts of his beautiful boat, which, he says, "surpassed any hotel in Europe," and the delicious fare supplied by his careful dragoman, or procured by his own gun, we are prepared—however contrary to our previous notions—to believe his testimony, that "for lovers of all that is *luxurious in travel*, of all that is glorious in memory, of the grand, the beautiful, the picturesque and the strange, Egyptian travel is the perfection of life."

The style of the book is easy and flowing, sometimes rising into a strain of much beauty and pathos. There are, however, many things open to criticism. We cannot reconcile the apparently deep religious feeling at times breathed by the author, or his "good old Presbyterian habits," with his very frequent references to the habitual use of "a bottle of St. Peray," or "Chateau Lafitte," "a cask of Marsala wine," "a half dozen of brandy," &c.; and especially with his occasional use of such phrases as "raising the devil," "infernal," &c., which seem to us to border on the profane. He tells a story, also, of a gross deception he practiced on his Arab guides in the crocodile pits, with as much gusto as ever Barnum did.—Page 427. But aside from these blemishes, we regard his work as worthy of popular favor, and as particularly valuable to all who intend visiting Egypt. His account of the present condition of the Egyptian people is gloomy enough to kindle new missionary zeal in every Christian heart. "The miserable, abject, wretched appearance of nine-tenths of the population of Egypt beggars description." "Of the Mussulmans, *four-fifths* or *five-sixths* are infidels. On my boat, which had nineteen professed Mussulmans, there were but *three* who prayed."

**LOS GRINGOS: or, An Inside View of Mexico, California, Peru, Chili, Polynesia, &c.** By Lieutenant WISE, U. S. N. (C. Scribner, New-York. 12mo. pp. 453.

This is a new edition of a book written some years ago, and describing the author's adventures in California and Mexico, during the war between the United States and the latter country, with an account of his visits to various ports in Peru, Chili and the Sandwich Islands. It is, doubtless, well adapted to secure popularity in certain quarters, but it is not at all to our taste. His descriptions of scenery are very graphic, and his sketches of the inhabitants of the various countries are characteristic

and striking; but he betrays too great a partiality for *low life* and its accompanying pleasures. He need not have confessed that he is "fond of tobacco and ladies," for on almost every page we have glowing descriptions of "charming Creoles," pretty *doncellas*, Spanish *señoritas*, Hiloan *wyhenees*, or Tahitian belles; while the opera, the theatre, balls, fandangos, cards, cigars, *cigarillos*, cognac, sherry, absinthe, aguardiente, musical, and sundry other *licores*, play a very prominent part in the narrative. He tells us with apparent indignation, "that the missionaries' efforts (in the Sandwich Islands) were but a breath in stemming the torrent of bad examples, caused by hundreds of loud voices from every merchant vessel and *ship of war* touching at the group;" and yet details with apparent gusto his playing cards and *bathing* with these "nut-brown maids," and his attempt to induce them to perform for him the **NATIVE DANCE!** We cannot recommend the book for a family library, as its moral tone is far below the Christian standard.

**THE NORSE FOLK; or, A Visit to the Homes of Norway and Sweden.**  
By C. L. BRACE, author of "Home Life in Germany," and "Hungary in 1851." (C. Scribner, New-York. 12mo., pp. 516.)

A very different book from the one just noticed. It is a record of the observations of a well informed, sensible Christian traveler, in countries which—as having formerly exerted a mighty influence on European and American civilization, and as now the homes of people linked to our own by many ties—are worthy of our deep interest and careful study. Mr. Brace takes the reader with him into the peasant's hut, the gentleman's villa, the spacious farm house, the modest parsonage, and the nobleman's castle; places him at the dinner-table, in the school-room, the court-room, the hospital, the church, in short, wherever the people and their customs can be seen to the greatest advantage. His work abounds with facts and statistics evincing the gratifying progress of those countries in agriculture, commerce, education and morals. The temperance reformation, it seems, has wonderfully advanced of late years, especially in Sweden, since the adoption of laws imposing such enormous licenses for the sale of liquor, as to make it too expensive for the poorer classes.

He gives us many of the superstitious but poetic legends of the North, and a chapter on the Scandinavian mythology. His description of the "midnight sun" is beautiful, and his account of the famous maelstrom destroys our childish notion of its grandeur, reducing it to nothing more than "a rapid stream of tide between two rocks."

But to us the most interesting facts in the book are those pertaining to the religious state of Norway and Sweden. Among the Finns and Lapps within a few years there has been a remarkable religious movement. From our author's account of it, the new sect seems closely to resemble the Baptists. They are "against child baptism; and say no one should be baptist without his own will;" reject the priest's vestments, ceremonies and absolution, and oppose dancing, drinking, and other worldly amusements. They attach all value to the Bible as their guide, and "want the Church utterly kept apart from the State." In Sweden there is prevalent among all classes "utter distrust and dissatisfaction towards their religious teachers," and "a thirst in the hearts of the people for true religion." "We want the Reformation as much as they did in Luther's time," is quite common language. The Baptists and Methodists are earnestly at work there, and though severe laws have recently been passed against them, "each day their cause grows stronger, and takes deeper hold of the hearts of the people." The author predicts that "this century will see the disruption and convulsion of the Swedish State Church."

**HISTORY OF TURKEY.** By A. DE LAMARTINE. Translated from the French. 3 vols. (12mo. pp. 1228. D. Appleton & Co., New-York.)

Turkey has recently been invested with new interest in the eyes of Christendom, by the attempt of Russia to crush her, and by the alliance of Romanist and Protestant nations with her—in her desperate resistance—the Cross upholding the Crescent.

The poet orator Lamartine has in these volumes thrown around the facts of Turkish history,—in themselves highly dramatic and exciting,—the gorgeous drapery of his eloquence. He enjoyed unusual advantages for the work, from his “divers sojourns in Turkey, examination of the celebrated places, the cities, the monuments, the battle fields, and his personal relations with the most eminent men of the empire,” and not less from his enthusiasm in behalf of what he regarded as an oppressed people fighting for the liberties of Europe.

The Preface contains a sketch of the causes and importance of the late war with Russia; the History opens with an account of Mahomet, his life, character and religion, and closes with the deposition of Mahomet IV—in 1686. It will doubtless be continued to the present time. There are, occasionally, however, unmistakable evidences that the poet has usurped the place of the historian, and has sometimes recorded as facts, incidents that bear the stamp of the Oriental imagination. These volumes are beautifully printed, and worthy of a place in every library.

**MARRIED OR SINGLE?** By the author of “Hope Leslie,” “Redwood,” “Home,” &c. Two Volumes. (12mo. New-York: Harper and Bro’s.)

We wish all works of fiction were as pure in their moral tone as are these volumes. While their chief design is to exhibit the blessedness of a truly Christian marriage, and the nobleness of a *single life* devoted to the good of man and the glory of God, incidentally the heartlessness of fashionable life, the sins which pass unnoticed because “plated in gold,” and many other prevalent follies and evils of modern society, receive keen thrusts from the author’s polished pen. Miss Sedgwick was one of the most popular writers of a generation which is now fast passing away, and in this work she gives evidence that her talents have not lost any of their power to charm or to instruct. The only grave objection we would make to it is that it is too long. So many characters are introduced that the unity of the plot is injured, and the story spun out to a tedious length.

**A CHILD’S HISTORY OF GREECE.** By JOHN BONNER, author of “Child’s History of Rome,” &c. In two volumes. With numerous illustrations. (New-York: Harper & Brothers. 18mo., pp. 315—287.)

No private publishers in this country have issued so many exquisite and valuable books for the young as the Messrs. Harper. This History of Greece has everything in it to make it attractive. The fascinating fables of the Grecian mythology, so simplified as to interest the youthful mind, the wonderful events and world-renowned men of Grecian history described in the clearest manner, and all illustrated by wood-cuts of the scenery, temples, ruins, people, warriors and deities of that classic land, copied principally from the ancient sculptures, together make a work which every sensible boy or girl must highly prize.

**THE CHILD’S BOOK OF NATURE.** Three parts in one. Part I.—Plants. II.—Animals. III.—Air, Water, Heat, Light, etc. By WORTHINGTON HOOKER, M.D. Illustrated by numerous Engravings. (New York. 18mo., pp. 120, 170, 179.)

And what shall we say of this book? That its *design* is excellent—to teach children to *observe* and *think*; to learn not from books merely, but to use their eyes, and ears, and minds, in studying “the wonderful phenomena all around us and within us;” that its *execution* is equally excellent, both in its simple and beautiful explanations and descriptions of nature, and in its numerous and life-like engravings of flowers, plants, animals, &c.; and that altogether it will be difficult to find anywhere a book which will make a prettier or more useful present to children than this.

THE FIVE GATEWAYS OF KNOWLEDGE. By GEORGE WILSON, M.D., F.R.S.E., Regius Professor of Technology in the University of Edinburgh, etc. (Philadelphia: Parry & McMillan. 1857. 18mo., pp. 139.)

The five senses,—styled by John Bunyan, “Eye-gate, Ear-gate, Nose-gate, Mouth gate, and Feel-gate,”—are discussed in this little volume with much delicacy of thought and beauty of language. Their appropriate organs are described, their use and value pointed out, their intellectual and aesthetical offices indicated, the importance of cultivating and perfecting them urged, and the moral lessons to be learned from them inculcated. No one can read the book without being deeply impressed with the wisdom and goodness of God, and led to feel more intensely his obligations to gratitude and devotion.

LIFE SCENES FROM MISSION FIELDS: A Book of Facts, Incidents and Results, the most natural and remarkable in missionary experience, condensed and arranged for popular use, by E. D. MOORE. With an Introduction by Rev. HUBBARD WINSLOW. (New York: Charles Scribner. 12mo., pp. 358.)

This might be appropriately called “Missionary Anecdotes,” being really a collection of more than five hundred interesting anecdotes, illustrating the native character of the heathen, and the wonderful effects of the gospel in transforming that character, and blessing them socially and spiritually. These “facts, incidents and results” are appropriately arranged, and the book—which must have cost much labor—will prove a valuable store-house of illustrations for the preacher, especially in the monthly meeting of prayer for missions.

HARPER'S STORY BOOKS. No. 34—“Jasper.” No. 35—“Viola.” Harper & Brothers, New-York. pp. 160. It is enough to announce the issue of these charming little books, and to say that they are written by Jacob Abbott.

THE BIOGRAPHICAL HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY, From its Origin in Greece down to the Present Day. By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. “Man is not born to solve the mystery of Existence; but he must nevertheless attempt it, in order that he may learn how to keep within the limits of the Knowable.”—GETHE.

“For I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,  
And the thoughts of men are widened by the process of the Suns.”—TENNYSON.

New Library Edition, much enlarged and thoroughly revised. In one handsome volume. (New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 8vo., pp. 835.)  
This work will be noticed in our next number.

---

#### ART. IX.—LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL INTELLIGENCE.

##### AMERICAN.

COMPARATIVELY few books have been published during the last quarter. Besides those noticed in the preceding pages, the following are among the most valuable which have been issued:

Virtue, Emmins & Co., New-York, have published “America and American Methodism, by the Rev. Frederick J. Jobson, with prefatory letters by the Rev. Thomas B. Sargent, D.D., of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Baltimore, and the Rev. John Hannah, Representative from

the British Conference in the years 1824 and 1856. Illustrated from Original Sketches by the Author."

Lindsay & Blakiston, Philadelphia, have issued "An Exposition of the Biblical Cosmology, and its Relations to Natural Science." By Jno. Henry Kurtz, D.D., Professor of Church History in the University of Dorpat.

H. Cowperthwait & Co., Philadelphia, have published, a "Hand Book of French Literature, Historical, Biographical and Critical." Revised and Edited by James B. Angell, Professor of Modern Languages in Brown University.

A. S. Barnes & Co., New York, have published a "A Key to the Geology of the Globe: an Essay, designed to show that the present Geographical, Hydrographical, and Geological Structures observed on the earth's crust, were the result of forces acting according to fixed, demonstrable laws, analogous to those governing the development of organic bodies," by Richard Owen, M.D., Professor of Geology and Chemistry in the University of Nashville.

Little, Brown & Co., Boston, have published, "A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography;" intended as a companion work to the Dictionaries of "Greek and Roman Antiquities," and of "Greek and Roman Mythology," and uniform with those works. By Dr. William Smith. Illustrated by numerous Engravings on Wood. Complete in two thick octavo volumes.

Charles Scribner, New-York, has published "A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles." By J. Addison Alexander, D.D. In two volumes, uniform with the Psalms.

J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia, have published, "Old Churches, Ministers, and Families of Virginia." By Bishop Meade. Two volumes octavo.

Derby & Jackson have published a new novel entitled "Moss-Side. By Marion Harland. Author of "A lone," and "The Hidden Path." It is said to be superior to either of her former works.

The Harpers are re-publishing, from early sheets of the London Editions, "The Explorations of Dr. Barth in Northern Central Africa, and those of Dr. Livingstone in Southern and Central Africa." The former work, which, in the English edition, extends to five large 8vo volumes, will, without any omission, even of the sterling illustrations, be issued in this country in three volumes octavo, at about one-third the cost of the foreign. The first of these volumes is just out of the press, extending to nearly 700 pages. Dr. Livingstone's work is to be comprised in a single large volume, with copious and very graphic illustrations. The discoveries which they develop will be fully noticed in an early No. of the Review.

Robert Carter & Brothers have issued "Expositions on the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, by Robert Leighton, D.D., Archbishop of Glasgow, with an Introductory Essay, by John Pye Smith, D.D." Also an "Exposition of the Assembly's Catechism, with Practical Inferences from each Question, as exhibited in the Lord's Day Exercises in Dartmouth, in the First Year of Liberty, 1688," by Rev. John Flavel. Also "The Knowledge of God, objectively considered, being the first part of Theology considered as a science of positive Truth, both Inductive and Deductive." One volume, 8vo. By Robert J. Breckenridge, D.D., one of the clearest and deepest thinkers in the Presbyterian Church.

The following are announced as in Press:

By Gould & Lincoln, Boston—Mental Philosophy; including the Intellect, the Sensibilities, and the Will, by Joseph Haven, Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in Amherst College. The Witness of God, by James Buchanan, D.D., LL.D., Author of "Modern Atheism."

By Messrs. Sheldon, Blakeman & Co., New-York—*The Saint and his Saviour*, by Rev. C. H. Spurgeon. *Charity and the Gospels: Sermons* by Wm. R. Williams, D.D. *Sermons to the Churches*, by Rev. F. Wayland, D.D. *Winer's Grammar of the New Testament*, translated from the sixth greatly enlarged and improved German edition. *Contributions to Ecclesiastical History*, by Sir James Stephen. *Memoir of Rev. Robert F. Ellis*, Alton, Ill., with an Introduction by Rev. J. G. Warren, D.D.

D. Appleton & Co. announce in Press—“*The Queens of England and their Times*, from Matilda, Queen of William the Conqueror, to Adelaide, Queen of William the Fourth,” by Francis Launcelot. “*History of the Republic of the United States*; as traced in the Writings of Alexander Hamilton, and of his contemporaries,” by John C. Hamilton. 3 volumes. 8vo. “*The Encyclopædia of American Eloquence*,” by Frank Moore. Illustrated with fourteen portraits. “*Benton's Abridgment of the Congressional Debates*.” Fifteen volumes, large 8vo. Volumes 4 to 15. “*Buckle's History of Civilization*.” Two volumes. 8vo. The Appletons are also preparing a *Cyclopædia*, to be completed in 15 volumes, of which the first volume is to appear in January, 1858, and which promises to supply the urgent want of a new work of the kind.

Whittemore, Niles & Hall, Boston, will soon publish—“*The Golden Age of American Oratory*.” Congress, the Bar and the Platform; with illustrative studies of Clay, Webster, Choate, Edward Everett, Fisher Ames, Pinkney, Chapin, Beecher, Wendell Phillips. By Edward G. Parker, Esq., of the Boston Bar.

Messrs. Derby & Jackson, New-York, will soon publish—“*The Life of Thomas Jefferson*.” In three octavo volumes. By Henry S. Randall, LL.D. “*The Lives of American Merchants*.” By Freeman Hunt, A.M., Editor of “*The Merchants' Magazine*.” Two volumes, octavo, with 20 Portraits on Steel.

Mason Brothers announce—“*The Life and Times of Aaron Burr*.” By James Parton. Author of “*Life of Horace Greeley*,” etc. With Portraits.

Mr. Parton claims that in this book the story of the Life of Aaron Burr will be told for the first time.

Prof. Ripley, of Newton Theological Institution, has in course of Publication a volume of Notes on the Epistle to the Romans. The work is already more than half through the press, and will probably be issued not long hence.

Rev. Howard Malcom, D.D., late President of Lewisburg University, is about to issue a new edition of Butler's *Analogy*, with copious notes and a list of questions to develop the sense, adapting it to use in schools and colleges.

Parry & McMillan, of Philadelphia, have nearly ready—“*Lectures on the History of Ancient Philosophy*.” By the Rev. William Archer Butler. Edited, from the Author's MSS., with Notes, by William Hepworth Thompson, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge. 2 vols.

A revised and enlarged edition of Prof. Hackett's *Commentary on the Acts* is passing through the press. It will be increased at least an hundred pages. Use has been made of several very important works in English and German, which have appeared since the publication of the first edition. Many of the notes have been re-written.

Messrs. Little & Brown will soon publish two volumes of the great national work of Professor Agassiz, entitled—“*Contributions to the Natural History of the United States*.” This will be in ten volumes, 4to.

## ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

## ORDINATIONS.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| T. P. Briggs, West Hoosick, N. Y., July 15th.  | J. B. Kemp, Ohio, July 11.                     |
| J. R. Babcock, Fulton Co., Ind., June 21.      | J. B. Kimber, Bemarsville, N. Sept. 1.         |
| A. D. Bush, Iowa, Aug. 9.                      | J. C. Long, Richmond, Virginia, July 5.        |
| S. D. Bowker, Centreville, Ohio, Sept. 1.      | A. H. Lang, Canandaigua, New-York, July 14.    |
| James A. Clark, Pittsfield, Mass., July 2.     | Wm. Lake, Yorkville, New-York, July 25.        |
| D. H. Cooley, Clyde, New-York, July 16.        | J. W. McCown, Richmond, Va., July 5.           |
| R. C. Stewart, Sugar Creek, Ga., Aug. 30.      | Enos Munger, Providence, R. I., July 15.       |
| J. M. Dawson, South Hampton, Ky., July 5.      | B. F. Marable, Halifax Co., Va., June 12.      |
| Alvah H. Dooley, Northfield, Ind., Aug. 2.     | M. H. Neal, Spring Creek, Tenn.                |
| R. B. Derosche, Detroit, Mich., July 30.       | A. K. Nott, New-York, Sept. 3.                 |
| David Evans, Jr., Kaignsville, N. J., June 29. | Daniel O'Quinn, La., June 13.                  |
| Wm. Fitz, Westerly, Rhode Island, July 23.     | Barton Ogle, Iowa, July 11.                    |
| Jas. P. Ferguson, Westford, Vt., Aug. 27.      | H. E. W. Palmer, Corinth, New-York, July 16.   |
| Chas. F. Foster, Neponset, Mass., Sept. 3.     | Thos. Pittman, N. C., April 28.                |
| John Fairman, Troy, New Hampshire, Aug. 26.    | Adolph Patze, Doorvillage, Ind., June 14.      |
| D. B. Gunn, Warsaw, Illinois, August 15.       | B. G. D. Pope, Edmundston, N. Y., Aug. 14.     |
| O. W. Gates, Greenville, Connecticut, Aug. 26. | G. A. Peltz., Philadelphia, Pa., Sept. 24.     |
| A. M. Higgins, Boston, Massachusetts, July 19. | A. H. Simons, Lanesboro, Mass., June 24.       |
| D. W. Halstead, Aldenville, Pa., July 23.      | Jos. Small, Williamstown, Vt., July 8.         |
| Theophilus A. Hall, Va. June 28.               | L. H. Shuck, Caswell, N. C., Aug. 16.          |
| W. E. Hatcher, Bedford, Va., Aug. 8.           | B. H. Timmermon, Good Hope, Ala., May 9.       |
| George E. Horr, Chicopee, Mass., Sept. 1.      | J. P. Thompson, Tuskaloosa Co., Ala., Aug. 15. |
| John Harris, Lebanon, Virginia, July 26.       | W. H. Wallace, Murfreesboro., Tenn., June 28.  |
|  | Israel Wilkinson, Port Byron, N. Y., Aug. 26.  |

## CHURCHES CONSTITUTED.

South Walton, N. Y., June 18.  
 Herrickville, Pa., June 18.  
 Socorro, New Mexico, March 6th.  
 Macomb, Ill., July 2.  
 Leavenworth City, Kansas, May  
 31  
 West Greenville, Pa., July 9.  
 Mason, Ill., July 11.  
 Oxford, Ill., July 8.  
 Covington, Ky., July 19.  
 Ephesus, N. C.  
 Clinton, Iowa, June 2.  
 Woodbury, N. J., Aug. 6.  
 Hudson, N. J., Aug. 6.  
 North Fork, Ill., July 24.  
 Indianola, Ill., Aug. 1.  
 Sigourney, Iowa, July 18.  
 Spencer County, Ind., July 25.  
 Bingham, Pa., Aug. 5.  
 Millidgeville, Ill., Aug. 1.

Arbela, Ohio, August.  
 Elon, Va., Aug. 16.  
 Warsaw, Ill., August 15.  
 St. George, Kansas, August 2.  
 Winchester, Ohio, August 8.  
 Blewville, Ill., Aug. 1.  
 Brownsville, Kansas, July 5.  
 Topeka, Kansas, June 14.  
 Kauffman Co., Texas, June 22.  
 Farmington, Mich., Aug. 19.  
 Leesville, Va., Aug. 18.  
 Sacramento, Cal., Aug. 1.  
 Olmstead Co., Min. Territory,  
 Aug. 22.  
 Centreville, Min. Territory, Au-  
 gust 19.  
 East Aurora, Ill., Sept. 1.  
 Conklin, N. Y., Aug. 25.  
 Williston, S. C., Sept. 5.

## DEDICATIONS.

Williamsburg, Va., July 5th.  
 Mount Ed, Va., July 19th.  
 Pittsylvania Court House, Va.,  
 July 26th. Cost \$3000.  
 Antioch, Louisiana, June.  
 Lowell, Indiana, June 28.  
 Marietta, Ohio, July 5th.  
 Block Island, R. I., Aug. 28.  
 Ephesus, N. C., Aug. 2.  
 Marengo, Ill., July 22.  
 Nyack, N. Y., Aug. 19.  
 Moline, Ill., May 20.

Kilmarnock, Va., Aug. 2. Cost  
 \$6000.  
 Alba., Pa., August 8. Cost  
 \$1,800.  
 Union, Orange County, Virginia,  
 May 17.  
 Carmel, Pa., July 12.  
 West Chester, Pa., Aug. 19.  
 Cost \$9000.  
 Fisherville, R. I., Sept. 3.  
 Amboy, Ill., Sept. 13,

## DEATHS.

J. J. Sessions, Monroe County,  
 Ala., June 19.  
 D. F. Twiss, New Brunswick,  
 N. J., June 30., aged 39.  
 Jacob Rynerson, New Winches-  
 ter, Ind., May 29, aged 68.  
 John P. Evans, Ceres, Pa., May  
 2, aged 75.  
 E. A. Campbell, Sabine Parish,  
 La., May 7, aged 39.  
 P. H. Smith, Franklin Co., N.  
 C., July 20, aged 43.  
 James Greenlee, Richland, Tenn.,  
 April 24.

Richard Thompson, Milton, Con-  
 necticut, July 26, aged 59.  
 Benjamin Rafferty, Kentucky.  
 Amos Lee, Long Creek, Miss.,  
 May 6, aged 63.  
 M. C. Blankenship, Vermillion  
 County, Ill., June.  
 David Taylor, Terre Haute, Ind.,  
 August 2, aged 57.  
 Sanford Leach, Otoe City, Ne-  
 braska, Aug. 16, aged 50.  
 J. D. Newell, Carrollton, Ill.,  
 Aug. 18.

## GENERAL INDEX.

### A.

- ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE, - - - - - 110—126  
AIM OF THE PASTOR, - - - - - 161—181  
AFRICA, CENTRAL, MISSIONARY EXPLORATIONS IN - - - - - 422—448

### B.

- BOOKS, THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD IN - - - - - 43—60  
BAPTIST CHURCHES, PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF - - - - - 245—271  
BAPTISM, INFANT, CAUSES OF ITS DECLINE, - - - - - 271—295  
BOWEN'S EXPLORATIONS IN AFRICA, - - - - - 422

### C.

- COCKBURN'S MEMORIALS OF HIS TIME, - - - - - 60—81  
CHINESE SCRIPTURES, - - - - - 81—110  
CONCEPTION, THE IMMACULATE - - - - - 380—403  
CHURCH, MEANING OF - - - - - 593

### D.

- DIVERSITY OF INTERPRETATION, - - - - - 196—216  
DIVINE EXISTENCE, NATURE OF ARGUMENT FOR - - - - - 325—356  
DREAMS; THEIR NATURE AND USES, - - - - - 621—631

### E.

- EUROPE, ALISON'S HISTORY OF - - - - - 110—126  
"EKKLESIA," IMPORT OF - - - - - 593—620  
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD, - - - - - 160—323—489—649

### F.

- FUTURE STATE, - - - - - 1—30  
FUTURE STATE OF THE HEATHEN, - - - - - 31—43  
FUTURE OF SOCIETY, - - - - - 356—380

### G.

- GOD, NATURE OF ARGUMENT FOR BEING OF - - - - - 325—356  
GEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE, - - - - - 456

### H.

- HEATHEN, FUTURE STATE OF - - - - - 31  
HISTORICAL SKETCH OF TRACTARIANISM, - - - - - 216—244  
HISTORY OF EUROPE, ALISON'S - - - - - 110  
HOLINESS IN THE MINISTRY, - - - - - 580  
HISTORY OF NEW-ENGLAND, - - - - - 469  
HARRIS, SERMONS OF - - - - - 634

### I.

- INTERPRETATION, DIVERSITY OF - - - - - 196—215  
IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, - - - - - 380  
INSPIRATION, LEE ON - - - - - 316  
INSPIRATION, THORNWELL ON - - - - - 403—421  
IMMORTALITY, PLATO ON - - - - - 507

### J.

- JEHOVAH JIREH, - - - - - 492—506

### L.

- LITERATURE, ROYAL - - - - - 571—579  
LITERARY INTELLIGENCE, - - - - - 156—320—487—646  
LIFE PICTURES, - - - - - 632

	M.
MINISTRY, HOLINESS IN THE	580
MILLER, HUGH	182—449
MISSIONARY EXPLORATIONS IN AFRICA,	422
	P.
PASTOR, SPIRIT AND AIM OF	161—181
PUBLICATIONS, NOTICES OF NEW	126—326—460—632
PLATO ON IMMORTALITY,	507
PARKER ON IMMORTALITY,	531
	R.
ROYAL LITERATURE,	571
ROCKS, TESTIMONY OF	449
RECORD, ECCLESIASTICAL,	160—323—489—649
	S.
SPURGEON AS A PREACHER,	296—315
SOCRATES ON IMMORTALITY,	524
SCRIPTURE TRANSLATIONS IN CHINESE,	81
SOCIETY'S FUTURE,	356
	T.
TRACTARIANISM, HISTORICAL SKETCH OF	216—244
THEOLOGICAL INTELLIGENCE.	156—320—487—646
THORNWELL ON INSPIRATION,	403
TEMPERANCE, NOTT'S LECTURES ON	635
	U.
UNITARIANISM,	533—570
	W.
WHATELY'S FUTURE STATE,	1—30